arXiv:1608.05896v2 [math.DG] 27 Apr 2017

Geodesic and curvature of piecewise flat Finsler surfaces*

Ming Xu[1] and Shaoqiang Deng[2†]

[1]College of Mathematics
Tianjin Normal University
Tianjin 300387, P. R. China
Email: mgmgmgxu@163.com.

[2]School of Mathematical Sciences and LPMC
Nankai University
Tianjin 300071, P. R. China
E-mail: dengsq@nankai.edu.cn

Abstract

A piecewise flat Finsler metric on a triangulated surface M is a metric whose restriction to any triangle is a flat triangle in some Minkowski space with straight edges. One of the main purposes of this work is to study the properties of geodesics on a piecewise flat Finsler surface, especially when it meets a vertex. Using the edge-crossing equation, we define two classes of piecewise flat Finsler surfaces, namely, Landsberg type and Berwald type. We deduce an explicit condition for a geodesic to be extendable at a vertex, and define the curvature which measures the *amount* of such extensions. The dependence of the curvature on an incoming or outgoing tangent direction corresponds to the feature of flag curvature in Finsler geometry. When the piecewise flat Finsler surface is of Landsberg type, the curvature is only relevant to the vertex, and we prove a combinatoric Gauss-Bonnet formula which generalizes both the Gauss-Bonnet formulas for piecewise flat Riemannian manifolds and for smooth Landsberg surfaces.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 52B70; 53C60.

Key Words: piecewise flat Finsler surface; geodesic; curvature; Landsberg condition; Berwald condition.

1 Introduction

A closed manifold M is called a *piecewise flat Riemannian manifold* if it is given a triangulation and endowed with a metric, called a *piecewise flat metric*, such that all the simplices are Euclidean [5]. The systematical study on the curvature of these spaces was started by T. Regge in 1961 [12], and thoroughly explored by J. Cheeger, W. Müller and R. Shrader in 1984 [5]. The behavior of geodesics on a piecewise flat Riemannian

*Supported by NSFC (no. 11271198, 51535008) of China

†Corresponding author

manifold was studied by D. Stone in 1976 [13]. In recent years, the study of such spaces has become rather active due to its intriguing applications to computer programming for 3-dimensional visualization and many other fields. In addition, there are many research works on the geometric analysis for piecewise flat manifolds; see for example [6, 7, 8, 9, 10].

Let us explain the physical motivation to consider piecewise flat Riemannian manifold and Finsler spaces, especially their curvatures. An interesting fact is that the scalar curvature and the mean curvature of such spaces enter into the Hilbert action principle from which the Einstein field equations can be derived, hence the theory has application to the general relativity. Motivated by this, Regge introduced the scalar curvature of piecewise flat Riemannian manifolds and dealt with the convergence, but he did not give a rigorous proof. The theory is called Regge's calculus by physicists. From then on, many physicists employed Regge's calculus as a tool for constructing a quantum theory of gravity as well as for establishing some other physical theories; see for example [14, 15]. Regge's calculus was made rigorous by Cheeger, Müller and Shrader in [5]. Since recently Finsler geometry has proven to be very useful in physics and other scientific fields, we believe that a generalization of their theory to this more generalized case will definitely find many applications in physics as well as other fields.

The idea to define *piecewise flat Finsler metrics* and *piecewise flat Finsler manifolds* is similar to that for piecewise flat Riemannian manifolds. In fact, given a triangulation of a manifold, we can define the metric such that each simplex can be isometrically identified with a flat simplex in some Minkowski space. Typical examples are the boundaries of polyhedral regions in Minkowski spaces. Notice that there is an essential difference between piecewise flat Riemannian metrics and piecewise flat Finsler metrics, since for each dimension, up to affine equivalence, there is a unique Euclidean metric, but there are infinitely many different Minkowski metrics. As far as we know, there has been very few research works considering piecewise flat Finsler manifolds, even for the 2-dimensional case. Since Finsler geometry has proven to be very useful in various scientific fields, including general relativity, biology and medical imaging, we believe that the study of piecewise flat Finsler spaces, which are not so smooth as the regular ones having been considered extensively in the literature, will definitely find interesting applications in the reality world.

The goal of this paper is to study in some depth the geometric properties of piecewise flat Finsler manifolds. For the sake of simplicity and clarity, we concentrate on the 2-dimensional case. The main results of this work are some explicit description of geodesics and curvature of piecewise flat Finsler surfaces.

The behavior of geodesics crossing an edge (or more generally a simplex of codimension 1) is very classical. In the literature, it is called the Snell-Descartes law, which is related to the reflection and refraction of light rays. As this is the generic situation for geodesics, i.e., locally the initial direction of any geodesic can be perturbed to avoid passing a vertex, the behavior of geodesics crossing an edge provides the foundation for our further study. Using the edge-crossing equation for geodesics, we define two special classes of piecewise flat Finsler surfaces, namely, piecewise flat *Landsberg* surfaces and piecewise flat *Berwald* surfaces. Among these two concepts, the Berwald condition is stronger, which implies the other. We will show that a piecewise flat Landsberg surface shares many important properties with a smooth Landsberg surface. For example,

when M is connected and x is not a vertex, the length of indicatrix circle $\mathcal{S}_x^{\pm}M \subset T_xM$ of incoming or outgoing unit tangent vectors at x, with respect to the metric defined by the Hessian matrix, are all the same (we will denote this constant as θ_M, see Lemma 7.1).

The consideration of the behavior of geodesics at vertices is tricky. The discussion can be carried out in a small neighborhood of the vertex, which is modelled as a union of Minkowski cones with the unique common vertex. We call it the *tangent cone*, and simply denote it as T_xM. The key observation is that, a geodesic in T_xM not passing x can not rotate around x for infinitely many times, hence it can be presented as the union of two rays and a finite number of line segments (see Theorem 5.2). This fact is obvious for piecewise flat Riemannian surfaces, But not very easy in the Finsler context. Its proof for the general situation is quite lengthy, but for special cases, for example when F is reversible or of Landsberg type, there are some shortcuts. This key observation indicates there are only three types of maximally extended geodesics in T_xM, those consisting of one ray at x, those consisting of two rays at x, and those not passing x (see Corollary 5.3).

Using above local description for geodesics near a vertex, we shall give several equivalent conditions for a geodesic in T_xM extended from one ray at x to two rays (see Theorem 6.5 and Theorem 6.6). It must be pointed out that, the concept of curvature naturally appears to measure the *amount* of all such extensions for a given ray at x. It is a natural generalization of curvature in the piecewise flat Riemannian context. Similarly, it vanishes for non-vertex points. Its dependence on the (incoming or outgoing) tangent vector is similar to that of the flag curvature of a smooth Finsler surface. But when M is of Landsberg type, the curvature is not relevant to the vertex, similar to the curvature form of a smooth Landsberg surface (see Theorem 6.2).

Another main goal of this paper is to present a combinatoric version of the Gauss-Bonnet-Chern formula for piecewise flat Finsler surfaces. In Finsler geometry, a similar Gauss-Bonnet formula as in Riemannian geometry is only available for a Landsberg metric [3] [4]. Our combinatoric version of the formula for a compact connected piecewise flat Landsberg surface (without boundary) can be expressed as

$$\sum K(x) = \theta_M \chi(M),$$

in which the left side is a finite sum for all vertices and θ_M is the constant previously mentioned for connected piecewise flat Landsberg surfaces (see Theorem 7.2).

Finally, we would like to mention that many notions and methods are also valid for high dimensional piecewise flat Finsler spaces, and we expect that a combinatoric Gauss-Bonnet-Chern formula for piecewise flat Landsberg manifolds will also be valid; see [2] for the Finslerian case.

This work is organized as the following. In Section 2, we summarize some fundamental knowledge on Finsler geometry. In Section 3, we give the definition and notations for a piecewise flat Finsler surface. In Section 4, we define geodesics on a piecewise flat Finsler surface and study its behavior crossing an edge. We use the edge-crossing equation for a geodesic to define piecewise flat Landsberg surface and piecewise flat Berwald surface. In Section 5, we study the behavior of a geodesic at a vertex. In Section 6, we define the curvature at its vertices under the above mentioned conditions.

In particular, we prove that the curvature is irrelevant to the tangent vector when M is of Landsberg type. In addition, we answer the question when a geodesic can be extended at a vertex. In Section 7, we prove a combinatoric Gauss-Bonnet formula for piecewise flat Landsberg surfaces.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Minkowski norm and Finsler metric

A *Minkowski norm* F on a real linear space $\mathbf{V}$ is a continuous function $F : \mathbf{V} \to [0, +\infty)$ satisfying

(1) F is positive and smooth when restricted to $\mathbf{V}\backslash\{0\}$.

(2) $F(\lambda y) = \lambda F(y)$ when $\lambda \geq 0$.

(3) For any linear coordinates $y = y^i e_i \in \mathbf{V}$, the Hessian matrix

$$(g_{ij}(y)) = \frac{1}{2}[F^2]_{y^i y^j}$$

is positive definite for any $y \in \mathbf{V}\backslash\{0\}$.

The Hessian matrix of the second derivatives of F^2 defines an inner product

$$\langle u, v\rangle_y^F = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial s \partial t} F^2(y + tu + sv)|_{s=t=0} = g_{ij}(y)u^i v^j,$$

where $u = u^i e_i$ and $v = v^j e_j$. The third derivative of F^2 at $y \in \mathbf{V}\backslash\{0\}$ defines the Cartan tensor

$$C_y^F(u, v, w) = \frac{1}{4}\frac{d^3}{dr ds dt} F^2(y + ru + sv + tw)|_{r=s=t=0} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\langle u, v\rangle_{y+tw}^F|_{t=0}.$$

Notice that the Cartan tensor $C_y^F(u, v, w)$ is symmetric with respect to u, v and w, and $C_y^F(u, v, y) = 0$ for any u and v in $\mathbf{V}$.

A *Finsler metric* F on a smooth manifold M is a continuous function $F : TM \to [0, +\infty)$ such that it is smooth on the slit tangent bundle $TM\backslash 0$, and its restriction to each tangent space is a Minkowski norm. We also call (M, F) a Finsler space.

A Minkowski norm (resp., a Finsler metric) F is *reversible* if $F(y) = F(-y)$ for any $y \in \mathbf{V}$ (resp., $F(x, y) = F(x, -y)$ for any $x \in M$ and $y \in T_x M$).

As examples, Riemannian metrics are the the special class of Finsler metrics such that Cartan tensors vanish everywhere, or equivalently, for any local coordinates the Hessian $(g_{ij}(x, y))$ only depends on x. Randers metrics are the most simple and important non-Riemannian Finsler metrics [11], which are of the form $F = \alpha + \beta$ where α is a Riemannian metric and β is a 1-form. They can be further generalized to (α, β)-metrics which are of the form $F = \alpha\phi(\beta/\alpha)$, where α and β are similar as for Randers metrics and ϕ is a smooth function. Recently, there are many research works on (α, β)-spaces; see for example [1].

2.2 Minkowski space, triangle and cone

A real linear space $\mathbb{R}^n$ can be viewed as an Abelian Lie group as well as its Lie algebra. So a Minkowski norm F on $\mathbb{R}^n$ determines a bi-invariant Finsler metric on it as well, which will be simply denoted as the same F. We call F a Minkowski metric and $(\mathbb{R}^n, F)$ a *Minkowski space*, or a *Minkowski plane* when $n = 2$. Minkowski spaces are the most standard and simple flat Finsler spaces, i.e., the flag curvature is identically zero. The geodesics of Minkowski spaces are straight lines.

A Finsler space (T, F) (or its completion) is called a *Minkowski triangle*, if it is isometric to a (closed or open) triangle in the Minkowski plane $(\mathbb{R}^2, F)$, which have three vertices and three edges. Similarly we can define a (2-dimensional) *Minkowski cone*, corresponding to the region between two rays from a point in $(\mathbb{R}^2, F)$. So we see a Minkowski cone has one vertex and two edges. Roughly speaking, when the "angle" between the two edges is not too big, a Minkowski cone can be regarded as a Minkowski triangle with two vertices (and also the edge between them) at infinity. In later discussions, we also need to deal with some important Minkowski cones with big "angles". For example, with the vertices and edges properly chosen, any whole Minkowski space and any Minkowski half plane can be regarded as Minkowski cones.

2.3 Geodesic and curvature

In a Finsler space (M, F), the length of a tangent vector is defined by the metric function F. So for any piecewise smooth path $\{p(t), t \in [a, b]\}$ (sometimes, we may denote it as $\{p(t), x_1, x_2\}$, where x_1 and x_2 are the initial point and end point respectively), the arc length

$$l(\{p(t), t \in [a, b]\}) = \int_a^b F(p(t), \dot{p}(t))dt, \tag{2.1}$$

and the distance function

$$d(x_1, x_2) = \inf\{l(\{p(t), t \in [a, b]\}), \forall \text{ piecewise smooth path } \{p(t), x_1, x_2\}\} \tag{2.2}$$

can be defined. It should be mentioned that the distance function is reversible iff the metric F is reversible, i.e. $F(x, y) = F(x, -y)$ for any $x \in M$ and $y \in T_xM$.

Using the variational method for the arc length functional (an equivalent and more convenient approach is to use the energy functional instead of the length functional), we can define the geodesics on a Finsler space, which are smooth curves $\{c(t), t \in I\} \subset M$, where I is a nonempty interval, satisfying the local minimizing principle, i.e., for each $t_0 \in I$, there exists a sufficiently small positive ϵ, such that for any $t_1, t_2 \in I \cap (t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon)$, $t_1 < t_2$, we have $l(\{c(t), t \in [t_1, t_2]\}) = d(c(t_1), c(t_2))$.

Flag curvature is a natural generalization of sectional curvature in Riemannian geometry. Given a nonzero vector $y \in T_xM$ (the flag pole), and a tangent plane $\mathbf{P} \subset T_xM$ spanned by y and w, the flag curvature is defined as

$$K^F(x, y, \mathbf{P}) = K^F(x, y, y \wedge w) = \frac{\langle R^F_y w, w\rangle^F_y}{\langle w, w\rangle^F_y \langle y, y\rangle^F_y - [\langle y, w\rangle^F_y]^2}, \tag{2.3}$$

where $R^F_y : T_xM \to T_xM$ is the *Riemann curvature* which appear in the Jacobi equation for a smooth family of geodesics of constant speeds (see [3] for its explicit presenting by standard local coordinates).

Notice that the flag curvature depends on y and $\mathbf{P}$ rather than w. When F is a Riemannian metric, it is just the sectional curvature and it is irrelevant to the choice of the flag pole.

3 The definition and some notations

Let M be a surface endowed with a locally finite triangular decomposition, i.e., $M = \bigcup T_i$, in which each T_i is a closed triangle in M, and any different T_i and T_j may only intersect at exactly one common edge or one common vertex.

Definition 3.1 *We say that M is a piecewise flat Finsler surface, if each triangle T_i is endowed with a flat metric F_i, such that*

(1) *Each (T_i, F_i) is a Minkowski triangle;*

(2) *If T_i and T_j have a common edge, then F_i and F_j coincide on this edge.*

For any $x \in M$, there are only finitely many closed triangles containing it. We list them as (T_1, F_1), ..., (T_n, F_n). They can be enlarged to Minkowski cones $C_{x,1}$, ..., $C_{x,n}$ with the unique common vertex x, and each F_i can be naturally extended to $C_{x,i}$. We call $T_xM = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} C_{x,i}$ a *tangent cone*. The point x is the only *vertex* in T_xM. When $i \neq j$, $C_{x,i} \cap C_{x,j}$ is either x, or a ray at x (we call it an *edge*).

For example, when x is not an edge point or a vertex, T_xM contains only one single Minkowski cone which can be identified with a Minkowski plane. When x is an edge point but not a vertex, T_xM contains two half Minkowski planes with the same boundary line, each of which is a Minkowski cone. When x is a vertex, because we have required any two different triangles can have at most 1 common edge, there are at least 3 triangles contains x, i.e. T_xM contains at least 3 Minkowski cones. Notice this requirement is not essential, but convenient. It can always be achieved by suitable subdivisions for M, which does not change the geometry of the piecewise flat surface.

Notice for each $x \in M$, it has a neighborhood which can be isometrically imbedded into T_xM, so it is convenient to use T_xM instead of M to study the local geometric properties (behavior of geodesics, curvatures, etc.) around x.

Now we define tangent vectors. The one-side derivative of the ray $\{c(t), t \in [0, \infty)\} \subset C_{x,i} \subset T_xM$ at $c(0) = x$ defines an *outgoing tangent vector* at x in $C_{x,i}$, denoted as $\dot{c}(0)^+$ or v^+. It can be presented as an *arrow* in $C_{x,i}$ with the initial point x. Similarly, we can define an *incoming tangent vector* $\dot{c}(0)^-$ or v^- at x in $C_{x,i}$, for the ray $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, 0]\}$ with $c(0) = x$, and present it as an *arrow* in $C_{x,i} \subset T_xM$ with end point x. To summarize, in both cases, we call it a *tangent vector* at x in $C_{x,i}$, and use the superscript $\pm$ to indicate it is incoming or outgoing.

Positive scalar multiplications on T_xM, regarding x as the origin, are well defined on each $C_{x,i}$, preserving the set of all outgoing (incoming) tangent vectors at x, and changing F_i by a scalar. Negative scalar multiplications of an incoming (outgoing) tangent vector at x can be naturally viewed as an outgoing (incoming) tangent vector at x, with its initial and end points of the arrow switched. Generally speaking, other addition and substraction on T_xM are only conditionally defined.

The length of a tangent vector $v^{\pm}$ at x is given by the norm F_i, when $v^{\pm}$ is presented as an arrow in $C_{x,i}$. If a nonzero tangent vector $v^{\pm}$ belongs to the edge between two different cones $C_{x,i}$ and $C_{x,j}$, by (2) in Definition 3.1, F_i and F_j defines the same length for $v^{\pm}$ in this case. If the cone $C_{x,i}$ is specified, we will simply denote the length of $v^{\pm}$ as $F(v^{\pm})$.

For the simplicity in later discussions, we will use the following notations for line segments and rays. For x_1 and x_2 from the same Minkowski space, cone or triangle, we denote by L_{x_1,x_2} the path along the straight line segment from x_1 to x_2, by v_{x_1,x_2} the vector represented by the arrow from x_1 to x_2 (it can be naturally regarded as an outgoing tangent vector at x_1 as well as an incoming tangent vector at x_2). Moreover, we denote by $R_{x',v^{\pm}}$ the curve $c(t)$ along the ray at $c(t') = x'$, which is defined for either $t \in (-\infty, t']$ or $t \in [t_0, \infty)$ for some t', depending on the outgoing or incoming vector $v^{\pm}$.

The set of all unit outgoing (incoming) tangent vectors in $C_{x,i}$ is denoted as $\mathcal{S}^+_{x,i}M$ ($\mathcal{S}^-_{x,i}M$ respectively). The unions $\mathcal{S}^{\pm}_x M$ of $\mathcal{S}^{\pm}_{x,i}M$ are called respectively the *outgoing indicatrix* and the *incoming indicatrix* at x. They are circles on which the arc length functionals are defined according to the Hessian matrices. We will simply use $l^{\pm}_x(\cdot)$ to denote arc length functional on $\mathcal{S}^{\pm}_x M$, and use it to define angles. Notice $l^+_x(\mathcal{S}^+_x M) = l^-_x(\mathcal{S}^-_x M)$ is obviously true when x is not edge or vertex points, but generally it is not true when x is on an edge, and in particular, when x is a vertex.

Now we define the *angle*, which has different appearances and notations in the following three cases.

Case 1. Let $\{v^{\pm}(t), t \in I\}$ be a continuous monotonous family of vectors in $\mathcal{S}^{\pm}_x M$, that is, $v^{\pm}(t)$ keeps rotating along $\mathcal{S}^{\pm}_x M$ in the same direction. Then we define $l^{\pm}_x(\{v^{\pm}(t), t \in I\})$ to be the angle that this family of unit vectors in $\mathcal{S}^{\pm}_x M$ have swiped.

Case 2. As a preliminary, we define the projection maps $\mathrm{Pr}^{\pm}_x : T_x M \backslash \{x\} \to \mathcal{S}^{\pm}_x M$. Given $x' \neq x$ in $T_x M$, there exist unique unit tangent vectors

$$\mathrm{Pr}^+_x(x') = \frac{v_{x,x'}}{F(v_{x,x'})} \in \mathcal{S}^+_x M$$

and

$$\mathrm{Pr}^-_x(x') = \frac{v_{x',x}}{F(v_{x',x})} \in \mathcal{S}^-_x M.$$

For a curve $\{x(t), t \in I\}$ on $T_x M$ not passing x and $\mathrm{Pr}^{\pm}_x(\{x(t), t \in I\})$ rotates monotonously in $\mathcal{S}^{\pm}_x M$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \sphericalangle^+_x(\{x(t), t \in I\}) &= l^+_x(\{\mathrm{Pr}^+_x(p(t)), t \in I\}) \\ &= l^+_x(\{\frac{v_{x,x(t)}}{F(v_{x,x(t)})} \in \mathcal{S}^+_x M, t \in I\}) \end{aligned}$$

to be the angle that this curve has swiped in $\mathcal{S}^{\pm}_x M$. The definition of $\sphericalangle^-_x(\cdot)$ is similar, using the projection map Pr^-_x.

Case 3. We can also define the angle between two outgoing (or incoming) tangent vectors at x as in classical geometry.

If v_1 and v_2 are two nonzero tangent vectors satisfying the following conditions:

(1) They can be parallelly moved to be outgoing tangent vectors v_{x,x_1} and v_{x,x_2} with x_1 and x_2 in some $C_{x,i} \subset T_x M$.

(2) The cone $C_{x,i} \subset T_xM$ described in (1) is unique.

Then up to re-parametrization, there exists a unique monotonous smooth family of unit vectors $\{v(s), s \in I\} \subset \mathcal{S}_x^+M$ connecting $v_{x,x_1}/F_i(v_{x,x_1})$ with $v_{x,x_2}/F_i(v_{x,x_2})$, and we define,

$$\angle_x^+(v_1, v_2) = l_x^+(\{v(s), s \in I\}).$$

We may also take the following equivalent definition,

$$\angle_x^+(v_1, v_2) = \sphericalangle_x^+(L_{x_1,x_2}).$$

The definition for $\angle_x^-(\cdot,\cdot)$ is similar.

Notice when x is not an edge point or a vertex, $\angle_x^\pm(v_1, v_2)$ can be defined when v_1 and v_2 are not vectors in opposite directions. We can use a suitable line passing x to divide the Minkowski plane T_xM into two half plane such that one of them contains both v_1 and v_2 (after they have been parallelly moved to be outgoing or incoming tangent vectors at x), and treat x as an edge point. Roughly speaking, we take the *less than flat angle*.

When x is an edge point but not a vertex, and v_1 and v_2 are parallel to the edge with opposite directions, the angle $\angle_x^\pm(v_1, v_2)$ may not be well defined because different *flat angles* may have different values.

When x is a vertex, because we have assumed there are at least three different $C_{x,i}$'s in T_xM, for any $x_1 \neq x \neq x_2$ in $C_{x,i}$, $\angle_x^+(v_{x,x_1}, v_{x,x_2})$ and $\angle_x^-(v_{x_1,x}, v_{x_2,x})$ are well defined.

4 Geodesics and the edge-crossing equation

4.1 Geodesics of a piecewise flat Finsler surface

On a piecewise flat Finsler surface (M, F), we can similarly define piecewise smooth curves or paths locally as a finite union of smooth curves defined on closed intervals. A smooth curve is required to be contained in a single Minkowski triangle. Notice that the tangent vector field $\dot{c}(t)$ on a piecewise smooth curve $c(t)$ are well-defined almost everywhere. The one-side tangent vectors $\dot{c}^\pm(t)$ at edge or vertex points are viewed as an outgoing and incoming tangent vector respectively. So we have the arc length $l(\{c(t), t \in I\})$ as in (2.1), and the distance function $d(\cdot,\cdot)$ as in (2.2).

Notice that if we change the term piecewise smooth in the above notion to piecewise linear, or if we change the triangulation by subdivisions, the distance function $d(\cdot,\cdot)$ will not be changed.

Now we are ready to define geodesics on a piecewise flat Finsler surface.

Definition 4.1 *A geodesic on a piecewise flat Finsler surface M is a piecewise smooth curve $\{c(t), t \in I\} \subset M$ defined on some interval I, satisfying the constant speed and local minimizing principles as the following:*

(1) *The length of $\dot{c}(t)$ is a nonzero constant wherever it is defined.*

(2) *For any $t_0 \in I$, there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$, such that whenever $t_1, t_2 \in I \cap (t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon)$ and $t_1 < t_2$, $\{c(t), t \in [t_1, t_2]\}$ is a minimizing path from $c(t_1)$ to $c(t_2)$, i.e., $l(\{c(t), t \in [t_1, t_2]\}) = d(c(t_1), c(t_2))$.*

In order to get explicit descriptions for geodesics on a piecewise flat Finsler surface, we study their local behaviors in the rest of this section for those crossing an edge, and in Section 5 for those through a vertex.

The behavior of a geodesic inside an open triangle is easy. It must be a straight line segment. It can be further extended in both directions until it meets an edge or a vertex.

The behavior of a geodesic crossing an edge at some point x which is not a vertex, is described by a classical theory called the Snell-Descartes law. To make this work self-contained, we will present this law in two approaches below, the variational method and the convexity technique.

4.2 The edge-crossing equation of geodesics

Let x be an edge point but not a vertex on the piecewise flat Finsler surface (M, F), and $\{c(t), t \in I\}$ with $x = c(0)$ is a unit speed geodesic.

First we assume $x = c(0)$ and the interval I contains $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume the speed of the geodesic $c(t)$ is 1. By the local minimizing property of geodesics, there are only two cases.

In the first case, there exists a sub-interval $I_1 \subset I$ such that the geodesic segment $\{c(t), t \in I_1\}$, is contained in an edge. Then it can be extended to the whole edge.

In the second case, none of the two tangent vectors $\dot{c}^+(0)$ and $\dot{c}^-(0)$ at x, outgoing and incoming respectively, coincides the directions of the edge E. Then the the geodesic contains two line segments in two sides of E with the common end point x.

To study the local behavior of the geodesic around x. Now we consider the geodesic $c(t)$ in the tangent cone T_xM. Denote $(C_{x,1}, F_1)$ and $(C_{x,2}, F_2)$ the two Minkowski half planes in T_xM, with the straight line $E = C_{x,1} \cap C_{x,2}$ passing x. Assume the geodesic $c(t)$ goes from $C_{x,1}$ to $C_{x,2}$. Then in T_xM, this geodesic can be extended to $t \in (-\infty, \infty)$, i.e., it is the union of the two rays $R_{x,\dot{c}(0)^-} \subset C_{x,1}$ and $R_{x,\dot{c}(0)^+} \subset C_{x,2}$. Let v be a F-unit vector in E.

Notice that such a geodesic is globally minimizing. In fact we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2 *Let x be any point on a piecewise flat Finsler surface. Assume $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ is a geodesic on T_xM consisting of two rays at x. Then it is a minimizing geodesic, i.e. for any $t_1 < t_2$, it is a minimizing path from $x_1 = c(t_1)$ to $x_2 = c(t_2)$.*

Proof. Notice that the geodesic $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ indicated in the lemma is preserved by any positive scalar multiplication on T_xM, which preserves each ray at x, and changes the arc length and distance by the same scalar. By a suitable positive scalar multiplication, any x_1 and x_2 on this geodesic can be moved to be sufficiently close to x, where we can apply the locally minimizing property for $c(t)$, which also proves the minimizing property of $c(t)$ from x_1 to x_2. ■

Using the variational method we can get the edge-crossing equation for geodesics.

Lemma 4.3 *Let $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ be a geodesic in T_xM crossing the line E from $(C_{x,1}, F_1)$ to $(C_{x,2}, F_2)$ at $c(0) = x$. Then we have*

$$\langle \dot{c}^-(0), v \rangle^{F_1}_{\dot{c}^-(0)} = \langle \dot{c}^+(0), v \rangle^{F_2}_{\dot{c}^+(0)}. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.2, the geodesic $c(t)$ is minimizing from $x' = c(-1)$ to $x'' = c(1)$. Consider a continuous family $\{p_s(t), t \in [-1,1]\}$ of paths from $x' = p_s(-1)$ to $x'' = p_s(1)$ defined for all s in a small neighborhood of 0, such that each path consists of two straight line segments L_{x',x_s} and $L_{x_s,x''}$, where $x_s \in E$ and the vector from x to x_s is $v_{x,x_s} = sv$. The arc length of $\{p_s(1), t \in [-1,1]\}$ is then $f(s) = F_1(\dot{c}^-(0) + sv) + F_2(\dot{c}^+(0) - sv)$. It is minimizing when $s = 0$, so

$$f'(0) = \langle \dot{c}^-(0), v \rangle^{F_1}_{\dot{c}^-(0)} - \langle \dot{c}^+(0), v \rangle^{F_2}_{\dot{c}^+(0)} = 0,$$

which completes the proof of the lemma. ■

We stress that (4.4) is crucial for the study of piecewise flat Finsler surfaces. In the following, we will refer to it as *the edge-crossing equation*. We have seen that it must be satisfied for any geodesic crossing an edge. By Lemma 4.6 below, we will see, it can be use to equivalently define the gedesics locally around an edge point which is not a vertex. Globally, any geodesic on a piecewise flat surface, which does not pass any vertex is a union of line segment $L_{x_i,x_{i+1}}$, such that each x_i is either an endpoint of the geodesic, or a point on some edge where the edge-crossing equation is satisfied.

In our further study of (4.4), the following convexity lemma for Minkowski norms will be useful.

Lemma 4.4 *Let $(\mathbf{V}, F)$ be a real vector space endowed with a Minkowski norm. Assume u, v and w are the F-unit vectors such that u is a non-negative linear combination of v and w. Then we have $\langle u, w \rangle^F_u \geq \langle v, w \rangle^F_v$, where the equality holds if and only if $u = v$.*

Proof. Obviously we only need to prove the lemma when $\dim \mathbf{V} = 2$. Fix the F-unit vector w and denote w' the F-unit vector which is opposite to w. The Legendre transformation which maps F-unit $u \in \mathbf{V}$ to the F^*-unit vector $\mathcal{L}(u) = \langle u, \cdot \rangle^F_u \in \mathbf{V}^*$ is a diffeomorphism from the indicatrix $\mathcal{S}^F \subset \mathbf{V} \backslash \{0\}$ to the indicatrix $\mathcal{S}^{F^*} \subset \mathbf{V}^* \backslash \{0\}$. Evaluation at w can be viewed as a linear function on $\mathbf{V}^*$, whose kernel is parallel to the tangent space of $\mathcal{S}^{F^*}$ at $\mathcal{L}(w)$ and $\mathcal{L}(w')$. So for any monotonous curve $w^*(t) \in \mathcal{S}^{F^*}$ from $\mathcal{L}(w')$ to $\mathcal{L}(w)$, $w^*(t)(w)$ is strictly increasing.

When two of u, v, w and w' are equal, the proof for the lemma is easy. So we may assume that they are distinct. By the assumption in the lemma, u is a positive linear combination of v and w, so u and v are contained in a monotonous curve $w(t)$ on $\mathcal{S}^F$, such that $w(0) = w'$, $w(t_1) = v$, $w(t_2) = u$, and $w(t_3) = w$ with $0 < t_1 < t_2 < t_3$. Correspondingly $\mathcal{L}(w(t))$ is a monotonous curve on $\mathcal{S}^{F^*}$ from $\mathcal{L}(w')$ to $\mathcal{L}(w)$. Our previous observation indicates

$$\langle u, w \rangle^F_u = \mathcal{L}(w(t_1))(w) < \mathcal{L}(w(t_2))(w) = \langle v, w \rangle^F_v,$$

which proves the lemma. ■

Lemma 4.4 implies the following monotonous relation between $\dot{c}^-(0)$ and $\dot{c}^+(0)$.

Lemma 4.5 *Let $\{c_1(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ and $\{c_2(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ be two different geodesics in T_xM, crossing $E = C_{x,1} \cap C_{x,2}$ from $C_{x,1}$ to $C_{x,2}$, with $c_1(0) = c_2(0) = x$. Let v be any nonzero vector on E. Then $\angle^-_x(\dot{c}^-_1(0), v) > \angle^-_x(\dot{c}^-_2(0), v)$ if and only if $\angle^+_x(\dot{c}^+_1(0), v) > \angle^+_x(\dot{c}^+_2(0), v)$.*

Proof. Assume $\angle_x^-(\dot{c}_1^-(0), v) > \angle_x^-(\dot{c}_2^-(0), v)$. Then $\dot{c}_2^-(0)$ is a positive linear combination of $\dot{c}_1^-(0)$ and v. By Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\langle \dot{c}_2^+(0), v\rangle_{\dot{c}_2^+(0)}^{F_2} = \langle \dot{c}_2^-(0), v\rangle_{\dot{c}_2^-(0)}^{F_1} < \langle \dot{c}_1^-(0), v\rangle_{\dot{c}_1^-(0)}^{F_1} = \langle \dot{c}_1^+(0), v\rangle_{\dot{c}_1^+(0)}^{F_2},$$

so by Lemma 4.4 again, in $\mathcal{S}_{x,2}^+M$, $-v/F(-v)$, $\dot{c}_1(0)^+$, $\dot{c}_2(0)^+$ and $v/F(v)$ are arranged with the order presented above, i.e., we also have $\angle_x^+(\dot{c}_1(0)^+, v) > \angle_x^+(\dot{c}_2(0)^+, v)$.

The proof for the other direction is similar. ■

The edge-crossing equation guarantees that any geodesic with an end point $x \in M$ on an edge but not a vertex can be further extended.

Lemma 4.6 *Let $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, 0]\} \subset C_{x,1}$ (or $\{c(t), t \in [0, \infty)\} \subset C_{x,2}$) be a unit speed geodesic in T_xM with $c(0) = x$. Then it can be uniquely extended to a geodesic for $t \in (-\infty, \infty)$, such that $\dot{c}^{\pm}(0)$ are related by (4.4).*

Proof. We first extend the geodesic $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, 0]\}$ to a unit speed curve for $t \in (-\infty, \infty)$, which is the ray $R_{x,\dot{c}^+(0)}$ when $t > 0$, satisfying (4.4).

First we need to prove the existence of such an extension, i.e. the existence of $\dot{c}^+(0)$ satisfying (4.4). Obviously when $\dot{c}^-(0)$ is tangent to E, then $\dot{c}^+(0) = \dot{c}^-(0)$. Implied by Lemma 4.5 and the implicit function theorem, the correspondence between $\dot{c}^-(0)$ to $\dot{c}^+(0)$ is a homeomorphism between $\mathcal{S}_{x,1}^-M$ and $\mathcal{S}_{x,2}^+M$. So for any $\dot{c}^-(0)$, we can find a unique $\dot{c}^+(0)$, such that the edge-crossing equation (4.4) is satisfied.

Next we prove such an extension $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ is a geodesic. We only need to prove that it is minimizing from $x' = c(-1)$ to $x'' = c(1)$.

Let v be any nonzero vector on $E = C_{x,1} \cap C_{x,2}$. We claim that any piecewise smooth path from x' to x'' passing x_s on E such that $v_{x,x_s} = sv$ has an arc length no less than

$$f(s) = F_1(\dot{c}(0)^- + sv) + F_2(\dot{c}(0)^+ - sv).$$

Assume conversely that it is not true. Then we can perturb the path to the union of a sequence of line segments $L_{x',x_1} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} L_{x_i,x_{i+1}} \cup L_{x_n,x''}$ such that x_s equals some x_i, and the total length is still less than $f(s)$. Using the triangle inequality repeatedly, we get $l(L_{x',x_s}) + l(L_{x_s,x''}) < f(s) = l(L_{x',x_s}) + l(L_{x_s,x''})$, which is a contradiction.

Now we prove $s = 0$ is the only minimum point for the smooth function $f(s)$. By Lemma 4.3, it is a critical point for $f(s)$. On the other hand, easy calculation shows $f(s)$ is strict convex function, i.e. whenever $s_1 \neq s_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& f(s_1) + f(s_2) \\
= \; & (F_1(\dot{c}^-(0) + s_1 v) + F_1(\dot{c}^-(0) + s_2 v)) + (F_2(\dot{c}^+(0) - s_1 v) + F_2(\dot{c}^+(0) - s_2 v)) \\
> \; & 2(F_1(\dot{c}^-(0) + \frac{s_1 + s_2}{2} v) + F_2(\dot{c}^+(0) - \frac{s_1 + s_2}{2} v)) \\
= \; & 2f(\frac{s_1 + s_2}{2}).
\end{aligned}$$

So $s = 0$ is the only critical point as well as the only minimum point of $f(s)$. This proves the curve $R_{x,\dot{c}(0)^-} \cup R_{x,\dot{c}(0)^+}$ is a geodesic from x' to x''.

The proof for extending $\{c(t), t \in [0, \infty)\}$ is similar. ■

Summarizing the above observations, we have

Theorem 4.7 *For any two different points x' and x'' in the tangent cone T_xM, where x is an edge point but not a vertex, there exists a unique unit speed geodesic from x' to x''.*

Proof. Assume $T_xM = C_{x,1} \cup C_{x,2}$ and the same straight line $E = C_{x,1} \cap C_{x,2}$. Let v be any nonzero vector in the direction of E. Let v be any nonzero vector on E. If x' and x'' are contained in the same $C_{x,i}$, then the only geodesic from x' to x'' must be the straight line segment $L_{x',x''}$.

Suppose x' and x'' are not contained in the same $C_{x,i}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $x' \in C_{x,1}$ and $x'' \in C_{x,2}$. Consider a family of paths from x' to x'', given by $L_{x',x_s} \cup L_{x_s,x''}$, where x_s is a point on E with $v_{x,x_s} = sv$. Its arc length is $f(s) = F_1(v_{x',x} + sv) + F_2(v_{x,x''} - sv)$. Since $\lim_{s\to\pm\infty} f(s) = +\infty$, it must reach a minimum, at $s = s_0$ for example. Then the argument in Lemma 4.3 shows the edge-crossing equation (4.4) is satisfied at $s = s_0$. Meanwhile, the argument in Lemma 4.6 shows $L_{x',x_{s_0}} \cup L_{x_{s_0},x''}$ is the only minimizing geodesic from x' to x''. ∎

The method in the proof of Lemma 4.6 can be applied to discuss the property of a geodesic passing a finite sequence of Minkowski triangles (T_i, F_i) and edges E_i. Let $c(t)$ be a geodesic $\bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} L_{x_i,x_{i+1}}$ from $x_0 \in (T_0, F_0)$ to $x_n \in (T_{n-1}, F_{n-1})$, passing the edges $E_i = T_{i-1} \cap T_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, at $x_i \in E_i$ which is not a vertex. Denote $u_i = v_{x_i,x_{i+1}}$ the vector in the Minkowski triangle T_i. Let v_i be a nonzero vector on each E_i. Then by Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\langle \frac{u_i}{F_i(u_i)}, v_i \rangle_{u_i}^{F_i} = \langle \frac{u_{i+1}}{F_{i+1}(u_{i+1})}, v_i \rangle_{u_{i+1}}^{F_{i+1}}, \quad \forall i = 0, \dots, n-1. \tag{4.5}$$

For a real parameter s, we consider another sequence of points $\{x_i'\}_{0\le i\le n}$, such that $x_0' = x_0$, $x_n' = x_n$, $x_i' \in E_i$ for $1 \le i \le n-1$, and $v_{x_i,x_i'} = sv_i$ (this requirement determine the interval I of all possible s). Connecting all the line segments $L_{x_i',x_{i+1}'}$, we get another path from x_0 to x_n, whose arc length is

$$f(s) = F_0(u_0 + sv_1) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} F_i(u_i + s(v_{i+1} - v_i)) + F_{n-1}(u_n - sv_{n-1}).$$

Similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.6 shows $f(s)$ is a strict convex function and $s = 0$ is the only critical point of f, so we have

Lemma 4.8 *Let $\{p_s(t), x_0, x_n\}$ be the path constructed above from x_0 to x_n. Assume there exists an interval I containing 0, such that the union of the paths $\{p_s(t), x_0, x_n\}$ defined above for $s \in I$ contains no vertices. Then the arc length function $f(s)$ is strictly convex and has the unique critical point at $s = 0$, i.e. it strictly increases for $s \ge 0$, and strictly decreases for $s \le 0$.*

4.3 The Landsberg and Berwald conditions

The edge-crossing equation (4.4) in Lemma 4.3 defines a continuous relation between $\dot{c}^-(0)$ and $\dot{c}^+(0)$. By Lemma 4.5 it defines a homeomorphism between $\mathcal{S}_{x,1}^- M$ and

$\mathcal{S}^+_{x,2}M$. By the implicit function theorem, it is in fact a diffeomorphism when $\dot{c}^{\pm}(0)$ are not parallel to E.

The edge-crossing equation can also be used to define some special types of piecewise flat Finsler surfaces. In particular, we can define the notions of *Landsberg* and *Berwald* surfaces in this setting.

Definition 4.9 *A piecewise flat Finsler surface M is called a piecewise flat Landsberg surface if for any x on an edge E between two Minkowski triangles (T_1, F_1) and (T_2, F_2) in M, which is not a vertex, the homeomorphism between $u_1^- \in \mathcal{S}^-_{x,1}M$ and $u_2^+ \in \mathcal{S}^+_{x,2}M$ defined by*

$$\langle u_1^-, v\rangle_{u_1^-}^{F_1} = \langle u_2^+, v\rangle_{u_2^+}^{F_2},$$

where v is any nonzero tangent vector in the direction of E, is an isometry with respect to the metrics on the indicatrices defined by the Hessian matrices. It is called a piecewise flat Berwald surface if the homeomorphism between u_1^- and u_2^+ is induced by a linear isomorphism between the tangent spaces $T_x(T_1)$ and $T_x(T_2)$.

Notice that the positions of (T_1, F_1) and (T_2, F_2) can be switched, so at any edge point x described in Definition 4.9, the Landsberg condition gives an isometry between $\mathcal{S}_x(T_1) = \mathcal{S}^-_{x,1}M \cup \mathcal{S}^+_{x,1}M$ and $\mathcal{S}_x(T_2) = \mathcal{S}^+_{x,2}M \cup \mathcal{S}^-_{x,2}M$ (hence also between $T_x(T_1)\backslash\{0\}$ and $T_x(T_2)\backslash\{0\}$) with respect to the metrics defined by the Hessian matrices. So the Hessian matrices define the same metrics at all smooth points (i.e. the complement of all edges and vertices) of M when M is connected. This is a key property of smooth Landsberg Finsler spaces. When M is Berwald, the non-vertex edge points are smooth points as well. Since the isometry between $T_x(T_1)\backslash\{0\}$ and $T_x(T_2)\backslash\{0\}$ is linear, (T_1, F_1) and (T_2, F_2) can be isometrically embedded in the same Minkowski plane, as two triangles with a common edge. So the complement of all vertices in M is a smooth incomplete Berwald surface.

Examples of piecewise flat Berwald surfaces include piecewise flat Riemannian surfaces. However, there are also many Non-Riemannian examples of Berwald type. For example, given a piecewise flat Riemannian surface, such that all the angles in the triangulation is an integer multiple of π/n for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can replace the Euclidean norms on the triangles with non-Riemannian D_{2n}-invariant Minkowski norms (here D_{2n} is the dihedral group), which makes M a non-Riemannian piecewise flat Finsler surface of Berwald type. Till now, we do not know whether any Landsberg surface M is Berwald, i.e., whether the answer to the combinational version of the 2-dimensional Landsberg problem (the unicorn problem) is positive.

5 Geodesics in the tangent cone T_xM for a vertex x

In this section, we study the local behavior of a geodesic near a vertex x, so the discussion can be restricted to the tangent cone T_xM. We will use the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1 *Let $(\mathbf{V}, F)$ be a real vector space endowed with a Minkowski norm, and u, v and w be F-unit vectors such that u is a non-negative linear combination of v and w and one of the following two conditions:*

(1) *F is reversible, i.e. $F(y) = F(-y)$ for all $y \in \mathbf{V}$.*

(2) $\langle v, w\rangle_w^F \geq 0$.

Then we have $\langle u, w\rangle_w^F \geq \langle v, w\rangle_w^F$, where the equality holds if and only if $u = v$.

Proof. We first assume F is reversible. Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 4.4, we can assume that $\dim \mathbf{V} = 2$. In the cases that $u = \pm w$, $v = \pm w$ or $u = v$, the lemma is obvious. So we may assume that u, v, w and $-w$ are distinct (in this case u is a positive linear combination of v and w). Then we only need to prove $\langle u - v, w\rangle_w^F > 0$. The indicatrix $\mathcal{S}$ in $\mathbf{V}$ is a smooth circle which bounds a strictly convex domain. The vectors u and v are contained in the same connected component of $\mathcal{S}\backslash\{\pm w\}$, which can be parametrized by its arc length as $w(t)$ with $w(0) = -w$, $w(t_1) = v$, $w(t_2) = u$, and $w(t_3) = w$. Since u is a positive linear combination of v and w, we have $0 < t_1 < t_2 < t_3$. Since F is reversible, the tangle lines of $\mathcal{S}$ at $\pm w$ are parallel. So from the strong convexity of $\mathcal{S}$, we have $\langle w'(t), w\rangle_w^F > 0$ for all $t \in (0, t_3)$, that is, $f(t) = \langle w(t), w\rangle_w^F$ is strictly increasing when $t \in [0, t_3]$, completing the proof of the lemma.

This proof is still valid when the reversibility condition is replaced by $\langle v, w\rangle_w^F \geq 0$, because $\langle w'(t), w\rangle_w^F > 0$ for $t \in (t_1, t_3)$ though it may fail for $t \in (0, t_1)$. ■

The main theorem of this section is the following.

Theorem 5.2 *Let M be a piecewise flat Finsler surface and T_xM the tangent cone of a vertex $x \in M$. Let $c(t)$ be a geodesic in T_xM. Suppose that there exists $x' = c(t') \neq x$, such that the tangent vector $\dot{c}^+(t')$ or $\dot{c}^-(t')$ at x' is not in the ray at x. Then $c(t)$ can be uniquely extended to a geodesic defined on $(-\infty, \infty)$, and it is a union of finite line segments and two rays as the following:*

$$\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\} = R_{x_1, v_1^-} \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} L_{x_i, x_{i+1}}) \cup R_{x_m, v_m^+}, \tag{5.6}$$

where R_{x_1,v_1^-}, L_{x_1,x_2}, …, L_{x_{m-1},x_m} and R_{x_m,v_m^+} are contained in the Minkowski cones $C_{x,0}$, …, $C_{x,m}$ respectively, and each $x_i \neq x$ is contained in the edge $E_i = C_{x,i-1} \cap C_{x,i}$. In particular, the geodesic $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ does not pass x, and neither of the line segments and rays in (5.6) is contained in an edge.

Proof. We first extend the geodesic $c(t)$ in the positive direction. Within the same Minkowski cone as $x' = c(t')$, the geodesic $c(t)$ intersects the line segment $L_{x,c(t)}$ transversally at each $c(t)$. The intersection of $c(t)$ with the edge is not x. After crossing the edge, by Lemma 4.6, $c(t)$ still intersects the line segment $L_{x,c(t)}$ transversally. So whenever the geodesic $c(t)$ can be extended, it does not pass x.

The proof of the theorem is reduced to the following key observation:

Assertion (A). The geodesic $\{c(t), t \in [t', +\infty)\}$ only intersects the edges in T_xM for finitely many times when t increases.

Now we switch to prove the Assertion (A).

Suppose there are exactly n different Minkowski cones and n different edges in T_xM. We denote them as $(C_{x,i}, F_i)$ and $E_i = C_{x,i-1} \cap C_{x,i}$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $(C_{x,i}, F_i) = (C_{x,i+n}, F_{i+n})$ and $E_i = E_{i+n}$ for all i. Let v_i be the unit vector on the edge E_i in the direction from x to x_i (we also have $v_i = v_{i+n}$ for all i).

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x' = c(t') \in C_{x,0}\backslash(E_0 \cup E_1)$ and $c(t)$ intersects E_1 when $t > t'$. Then with t increasing, the edges $c(t)$ intersects are sequentially E_1, E_2, E_3 and so on. Denote $\theta' = \angle^+_{x'}(v_1, \dot{c}(t'))$. The range of θ' is

$$0 \leq \theta' < \alpha = \angle^+_{x'}(v_1, v_{x',x}),$$

where the supremum corresponds to the line segment $L_{x',x}$.

When θ is small, the extension of the geodesic $c(t)$ can not intersect E_1 again. Assersion (A) is obviously true for this case.

When θ is big enough such that $c(t)$ intersect E_1 again, we can find $x'' = c(t'') \in C_{x,0}\backslash(E_0 \cup E_1)$ from the first return of $c(t)$ back to $C_{x,0}$. Then we define $\theta'' = \angle^+_{x''}(v_1, \dot{c}(t''))$, and claim

Assertion (B). $\theta'' < \theta'$.

Assuming Assertion (B), we can prove Assertion (A) as following. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the subset of $[0, \alpha)$ defined by all the number a such that whenever the geodesic $\{c(t), t \in [t', +\infty)\}$ with $c(t') = x' \in C_{x,0}\backslash(E_0 \cup E_1)$ satisfies $\theta' < a$, it intersects only finite edges. It is easy to see $\mathcal{A}$ is an interval containing 0. Using the edge-crossing equation repeatedly, it is not hard to observe that, for any geodesic $\{c(t), t \in [t', +\infty)\}$ with only finite intersections with the edges, we can change it by increasing its θ' a little bit, such that the number counting the intersection with edges remain the same or increase by 1, i.e. still finite. So $\mathcal{A} = [0, \beta)$ for some $\beta \in (0, \alpha]$. If $\beta < \alpha$, by Assertion (B), β is also contained in $\mathcal{A}$, which is a contradiction. So $\mathcal{A} = [0, \alpha)$, and Assertion (A) is proved.

Now we only need to prove Assertion (B).

By the edge-crossing equation (4.4), θ'' only depends on θ' rather than $x' = c(t')$. For θ'' to exist, θ' must be taken from an open interval (γ, α), where $\gamma > 0$ corresponds to a geodesic $c(t)$ with $t \geq t'$ which ends with a ray parallel to E_1 in $C_{x,0}$. When $\theta' \in (\beta, \alpha)$ is sufficiently close to γ, $\theta'' = \angle^+_{x''}(v_1, \dot{c}(t''))$ can be arbitrarily close to 0.

So if we assume conversely that Assertion (B) is not true, then by the intermediate value theorem, there exist a geodesic $c(t)$ satisfying $\theta' = \theta''$, and then $\dot{c}(t') = \dot{c}(t'')\theta'$. We denote $\{x_i \in E_i, 1 \leq i \leq n+1\}$ the first $n+1$ intersection points of $\{c(t), t \in [t', +\infty)\}$ with the edges, and $u_i = v_{x_i,x_{i+1}}/F_i(v_{x_i,x_{i+1}})$ for $0 < i \leq n$ the F_i-unit vector in the direction from x_i to x_{i+1}. The assumption $\theta'' = \theta'$ implies $u_0 = v_{x',x_1}/F_0(v_{x',x_1}) = u_n$ and $u_{i+n} = u_i$ can also be defined.

By the periodicity, there exists an i with the biggest $\langle u_i, v_i\rangle^{F_i}_{u_i}$. If $\langle u_i, v_i\rangle^{F_i}_{u_i} \geq 0$, then

$$\langle u_i, v_{i+1}\rangle^{F_i}_{u_i} = \langle u_{i+1}, v_{i+1}\rangle^{F_{i+1}}_{u_{i+1}} \leq \langle u_i, v_i\rangle^{F_i}_{u_i},$$

which is a contradiction with Lemma 5.1 because v_{i+1} is a positive linear combination of v_i and u_i. So we have $\langle u_i, v_i\rangle^{F_i}_{u_i} < 0$ for each i.

Denote v'_i the unit vector in the opposite direction of v_i, i.e. $v_i = c_i v'_i$ for some $c_i < 0$ and $F_i(v'_i) = F_{i-1}(v'_i) = 1$. Then for each i, v'_i is a positive linear combination of v'_{i+1} and u_i, and $\langle u_i, v'_i\rangle^{F_i}_{u_i} > 0$ for each i. We can choose i with the smallest $\langle u_i, v'_i\rangle^{F_i}_{u_i}$, then

$$\langle u_i, v'_{i+1}\rangle^{F_i}_{u_i} = \langle u_{i+1}, v'_{i+1}\rangle^{F_{i+1}}_{u_{i+1}} \geq \langle u_i, v'_i\rangle^{F_i}_{u_i}.$$

This is a contradiction with Lemma 5.1, which ends the proof of Assertion (B).

To summarize, the extension for the geodesic in the positive direction can only intersect the edges for finitely many times, it will provide a geodesic for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$, which contains finite many line segments and a ray.

For the extension of the geodesic in the negative direction, the argument is similar. To summarize, in T_xM, $c(t)$ can be extended to a geodesic for $t \in (-\infty, \infty)$, not passing x, and can be presented as the union of two rays and finitely many Line segments. ■

Using Theorem 5.2, we can provide an explicit description of all maximally extended geodesics in T_xM of a vertex x.

Corollary 5.3 *Let M be a piecewise flat Finsler surface and T_xM be the tangent cone of a vertex $x \in M$. Then a maximally extended geodesic in T_xM must be one of the following:*

(1) *A geodesic described in Theorem 5.2.*

(2) *A ray $R_{x,v^{\pm}}$, where $v^{\pm}$ is a nonzero incoming or outgoing tangent vector at x.*

(3) *The union of two rays $R_{x,v^-} \cup R_{x,v^+}$, where v^- and v^+ are nonzero incoming and outgoing tangent vectors at x respectively.*

The geodesics in (1) can be easily distinguished from those in (2) and (3). The crucial question is how to distinguish the geodesics in the cases (2) and (3).

Question 5.4 *Let M be a piecewise flat Finsler surface and T_xM the tangent cone of a vertex $x \in M$. Let $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, 0]\}$ or $\{c(t), t \in [0, +\infty)\}$ be a unit speed geodesic in T_xM with $c(0) = x$. Under what condition can one extend it to a geodesic defined on the whole $(-\infty, \infty)$?*

Before answering this question in the next section, some preparation is needed here. We now consider several different types perturbations of a geodesic passing the vertex x, which are important for answering Question 5.4 as well as defining curvature.

We first define the perturbations of $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, 0]\} \subset T_xM$ with $c(0) = x$, which are geodesics in (1) of Corollary 5.3. For $x_0 = c(-1)$, we denote $\mathcal{S}^{+,l}_{x_0}$ and $\mathcal{S}^{+,r}_{x_0}$ the two connected components of $\mathcal{S}^{+}_{x_0}(T_xM) \backslash \mathbb{R}\dot{c}(-1)$. The superscript l or r means *left side* or *right side*, respectively. Usually we can take an orientation on T_xM (i.e. a local orientation at $x \in M$) to specify the *left* and *right* sides of the geodesic $c(t)$ at x_0. If not specified, the choice of the local orientations will have no impact on later discussions or definitions.

Given a unit outgoing tangent vector $w^+ \in \mathcal{S}^{+,l}_{x_0}$ (or $w^+ \in \mathcal{S}^{+,r}_{x_0}$) at x_0, we can define a unit speed geodesic $\{c_{x_0,w^+}(t), t \in [-1, \infty)\}$ with $c_{x_0,w^+}(-1) = x_0$ and $\dot{c}^+_{x_0,w^+}(-1) = w^+$. Notice that such a geodesic can be extended to one with $t \in (-\infty, \infty)$, which is a geodesic not passing x, as described in Lemma 5.2, but here we only consider the part for $t \in [-1, \infty)$.

Another way to perturb the geodesic $c(t)$ is given by a sufficiently small parallel shifting of the geodesic $\{c(t), t \in (-1 - \varepsilon, -1 + \varepsilon)\}$ with sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, in the direction of w^+, where $w^+ \notin \mathbb{R}\dot{c}(0)$ is a unit outgoing tangent vector at x_0. Then the new geodesic can be extended to $(-\infty, \infty)$, which is a geodesic not passing x,

as described in Lemma 5.2. We denote it as $\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ or $\{c_{+,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$, according to $w^+ \in \mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{+,l}$ or $w^+ \in \mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{+,r}$ respectively. Here we add the subscript + since they are the extension of the geodesic in the positive direction. In this notation for the perturbation geodesic, we do not need to specify the exact choice of w^+, because only the sides for it are relevant to later discussion.

The following lemma is important for discussing curvature in the next section.

Lemma 5.5 *Let M be a piecewise flat Finsler surface and T_xM the tangent cone of a vertex $x \in M$. Keep all the notations as above. Let $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, 0]\}$ be the geodesic with $c(0) = x$ and $c(-1) = x_0$. Then we have the following:*

(1) *If $w^+, w'^+ \in \mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{+,l}$ (or $w^+, w'^+ \in \mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{+,r}$) satisfy the condition*

$$\angle_{x_0}^+(w^+, \dot{c}(-1)) > \angle_{x_0}^+(w'^+, \dot{c}(-1)^+),$$

then we have

$$\sphericalangle_x^{\pm}(\{c_{x_0,w^+}(t), t \in [-1, \infty)\}) < \sphericalangle_x^{\pm}(\{c_{x_0,w'^+}(t), t \in [-1, \infty)\}).$$

In particular, any ray from x intersects $\{c_{x_0,w'^+}(t), t \in [-1, \infty)\}$ if it intersects $\{c_{x_0,w^+}(t), t \in [-1, \infty)\}$.

(2) *The angles $\sphericalangle_x^{\pm}(\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\})$ are the limits of $\sphericalangle_x^{\pm}(\{c_{x_0,w^+}(t), t \in [-1, \infty)\})$ when $w^+ \in \mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{+,l}$ approaches $\dot{c}(-1)$. In particular, $\sphericalangle_x^{\pm}(\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\})$ only depends on the side of the parallel shifting. A ray from x intersects $\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ iff it intersects $\{c_{x_0,w^+}(t), t \in (-1, \infty)\}$ for some $w^+ \in \mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{+,l}$. The similar assertion is also true for perturbations to the right side.*

Proof. (1) According to Lemma 5.2, we can assume that $\{c_{x_0,w^+}, t \in [-1, \infty)\}$ is the union

$$L_{x_0,x_1} \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} L_{x_i,x_{i+1}}) \cup R_{x_m,u_m},$$

where $x_0 \in (C_{x,0}, F_0)$, and the line segments $L_{x_i,x_{i+1}}$ and the ray R_{x_m,u_m} satisfy the following conditions: for $0 \le i \le m-1$, $L_{x_i,x_{i+1}}$ is contained in $(C_{x,i}, F_i)$ but not in an edge, for $1 \le i \le m$, $x_i = c_{x_0,w^+}(t_i) \ne x$ is on the edge $E_i = C_{x,i-1} \cap C_{x,i}$, and for $0 \le i \le m$, u_i is the unit outgoing tangent vector at x_i for $L_{x_i,x_{i+1}}$ and R_{x_m,u_m}, i.e. $u_i = v_{x_i,x_{i+1}}/F_i(v_{x_i,x_{i+1}})$ when $i < m$. Denote v_i the unit tangent vector in the direction from x to x_i, $1 \le i \le m$, and in particular $v_0 = -\dot{c}(-1)/F_0(-\dot{c}(-1))$.

The geodesic $\{c_{x_0,w'^+}(t), t \in [-1, \infty)\}$ can be similarly presented as the union of m' straight line segments $L_{x'_i,x'_{i+1}}$ and the ray $R_{x'_{m'},u'_{m'}}$. Notice that it is a perturbation of $c(t)$ at the same side with $c_{x_0,w^+}(t)$, so we have $x'_0 = x_0$, and moreover, for $1 \le i \le \min\{m, m'\}$, $x'_i = c_{x_0,w'^+}(t'_i) \ne x$ is on the same edge E_i as x_i, and when $0 \le i \le \min\{m, m'\}$, $L_{x'_i,x'_{i+1}}$ (or $R_{x'_{m'},u'_{m'}}$ when $i = m'$) is contained in the same $C_{x,i}$ as $L_{x_i,x_{i+1}}$ (or R_{x_m,u_m^+} when $i = m$). Correspondingly, for $0 \le i \le m'-1$, we have unit outgoing vectors $u'_i = v_{x'_i,x'_{i+1}}/F_i(v_{x'_i,x'_{i+1}})$ at x'_i from x'_i to x'_{i+1} for each $i < m'$.

First we prove $m \le m'$. Our assumption on the two geodesics implies that $u_0 = w^+$ is a positive linear combination of $u'_0 = w'^+$ and $v_0 = -\dot{c}(-1)$. If $m = 0$, it is

done. Otherwise there exists an intersectional point x_1. Then v_1 is a positive linear combination of v_0 and u_0. Combining these two observations, we conclude that v_1 is a positive linear combination of v_0 and u'_0, which indicates the existence of the intersectional point x'_1. On the other hand, since u_0 is also a positive linear combination of u'_0 and v_1, by Lemma 4.4, we have $\langle u_0, v_1\rangle^{F_0}_{u_0} > \langle u'_0, v_1\rangle^{F_0}_{u'_0}$. Then by Lemma 4.3, we also have

$$\langle u_1, v_1\rangle^{F_1}_{u_1} = \langle u_0, v_1\rangle^{F_0}_{u_0} > \langle u'_0, v_1\rangle^{F_0}_{u'_0} = \langle u'_1, v_1\rangle^{F_1}_{u'_1}.$$

Notice that there exists only two possible cases, namely, either u_1 is a positive linear combination of u'_1 and v_1, or u'_1 is a positive linear combination of u_1 and v_1. By Lemma 4.4, the second case is impossible. Using this argument inductively, we can prove that $m \leq m'$.

Now we consider $C_{x,m}$. If R_{x,v^+} is a ray intersecting R_{x_m,u_m}, then the previous argument can also used to prove that R_{x,v^+} intersects $L_{x_m,x_{m+1}}$ when $m < m'$, or $R_{x'_m,u'_m}$ when $m = m'$.

The projection curve

$$\Pr^+_x(\{c_{x_0,w^+}(t), t \in [-1,\infty)\}) = \{\frac{v_{x,c_{x_0,w^+}(t)}}{F(v_{x,c_{x_0,w^+}(t)})} \in \mathcal{S}^+_x M, t \in [-1,\infty)\}$$

is a monotonous curve in $\mathcal{S}^+_x M$, and so do the projection curves with respect to $\Pr^-_x$ and for $c_{x_0,w'^+}(t)$. Above argument shows, counting multiplicities, $\Pr^\pm_x(\{c_{x_0,w^+}(t), t \in [-1,\infty)\})$ are respectively contained in $\Pr^\pm_x(\{c_{x_0,w'^+}(t), t \in [-1,\infty)\})$, so we have $\sphericalangle^\pm_x(\{c_{x_0,w^+}(t), t \in [-1,\infty)\}) \leq \sphericalangle^\pm_x(\{c_{x_0,w'^+}(t), t \in [-1,\infty)\})$. The equality holds only when $m = m'$ and u^+_m is parallel to u'_m. Using Lemma 4.3 repeatedly, we get $w^+ = u_0 = u'_0 = w'^+$. This is a contradiction. So the inequality is sharp. The other statement in (1) has been proved in the previous discussion.

(2) A similar argument as for (1) shows that, counting multiplicities, $\Pr^\pm_x(\{c_{x',w^+}(t), t \in (-1,\infty)\})$ is contained in $\Pr^\pm_x(\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty,\infty)\})$ for any $w^+ \in \mathcal{S}^{+,l}_{x'}$.

Now we prove that $\Pr^\pm_x(\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty,\infty)\})$ are respectively the limits of $\Pr^\pm_x(\{c_{x',w^+}(t), t \in (-1,\infty)\})$ when $w^+ \in \mathcal{S}^{+,l}_{x'}$ approaches $\dot{c}(-1)^+$. By Theorem 5.2, we can write $\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty,\infty)\}$ as the union

$$R_{x_1,u_1^-} \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} L_{x_i,x_{i+1}}) \cup R_{x_m,u_m^+},$$

where each $x_i \neq x$ is on the edge E_i, and each line segment or ray is not contained in an edge. For $1 < i < m$, we denote $u_i = v_{x_i,x_{i+1}}/F_i(v_{x_i,x_{i+1}})$ the unit outgoing vectors at x_i on $L_{x_i,x_{i+1}}$. Since both geodesics $\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty,\infty)\}$ and $\{c_{x',w^+}(t), t \in [-1,\infty)\}$ are on the left side of the geodesic $c(t)$ around x', $\{c_{x',w^+}(t), t \in (-1,+\infty)\}$ intersects the edges E_i sequentially. If $w^+ \in \mathcal{S}^{+,l}_{x_0}$ is sufficiently close to $\dot{c}(-1)^+$, then by the continuity implied by the edge-crossing equation (4.4), the edges that $\{c_{x',w^+}(t), t \in [-1,\infty)\}$ intersects are exactly all the m edges E_i. Let x'_i be the intersection points between $c_{x',w^+}(t)$ and E_i, and denote the unit outgoing tangent vectors $u'_i = v_{x'_i,x'_{i+1}}/F_i(v_{x'_i,x'_{i+1}})$ at x'_i, for $1 \leq i < m$, and u'_m for the Ray $R_{x'_m,u'_m}$ part of the geodesic $\{c_{x',w^+}(t), t \in [-1,\infty)\}$. When $w^+ \in \mathcal{S}^{+,l}_{x_0}$ is sufficiently close to $\dot{c}(-1)^+$, each

u_i' would be very close to the corresponding u_i. This implies that the difference part between $\mathrm{Pr}_x^{\pm}(\{c_{x',w^+}(t), t \in (-1,\infty)\})$ and $\mathrm{Pr}_x^{\pm}(\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty,\infty)\})$ respectively have sufficiently small arc length in $\mathcal{S}_x^{\pm}M$, when w^+ is sufficiently close to $\dot{c}(-1)$.

Combining the monotonous property we have shown in the proof of (1), with the fact that $\mathrm{Pr}_x^{\pm}(\{c_{x',w^+}(t), t \in (-1,\infty)\})$ are open curves in $\mathcal{S}_x^{\pm}M$, we complete the proof of the convergence for the sets and for the angles. The other assertions in (2) also follows immediately. ■

Next we consider the perturbation of a unit speed geodesic $\{c(t), t \in [0,\infty)\}$. For $x_0 = c(1)$, denote the two connected components of $\mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{-}(T_xM)\backslash\{\pm\dot{c}(1)\}$ as $\mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{-,l}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{-,r}$. Fix a local orientation of M at x. Then it defines the left side and right side. So one can similarly define the geodesics $\{c_{x_0,w^-}(t), t \in (-\infty,1]\}$ for $w^- \in \mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{-,l}$ or $\mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{-,r}$, and $\{c_{-,l}(t), t \in (-\infty,\infty)\}$ and $\{c_{-,r}(t), t \in (-\infty,\infty)\}$, where we add the subscript $-$ to indicate that they are the extension of a geodesic in the negative direction.

The following result is an analogue of Lemma 5.5. Since the proof is similar to the previous one, we omit it.

Lemma 5.6 *Let M be a piecewise flat Finsler surface and T_xM the tangent cone of the vertex $x \in M$. Keep all the notations as above. Let $\{c(t), t \in [0,\infty)\}$ be the geodesic with $c(0) = x$ and $c(1) = x_0$. Then we have the following:*

(1) *If $w^-, w'^- \in \mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{-,l}$ (or $w^-, w'^- \in \mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{-,r}$) satisfies the condition*

$$\angle_{x_0}^{-}(w^-, \dot{c}(1)) > \angle_{x_0}^{-}(w'^-, \dot{c}(1)),$$

then we have

$$\sphericalangle_x^{\pm}(\{c_{x_0,w^-}(t), t \in (-\infty,1]\}) < \sphericalangle_x^{\pm}(\{c_{x_0,w'^-}(t), t \in (-\infty,1]\}).$$

In particular, a ray from x intersects $\{c_{x_0,w'^-}(t), t \in (-\infty,1]\}$ if it intersects $\{c_{x_0,w^-}(t), t \in (-\infty,1]\}$.

(2) *The angles $\sphericalangle_x^{\pm}(\{c_{-,l}(t), t \in (-\infty,\infty)\})$ are respectively the limits of $\sphericalangle_x^{\pm}(\{c_{x_0,w^-}(t), t \in (-\infty,1]\})$, as $w^- \in \mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{-,l}$ approaches $\dot{c}(1)^-$. In particular, the angle $\sphericalangle_x^{\pm}(\{c_{-,l}(t), t \in (-\infty,\infty)\})$ only depends on the side of the parallel shifting. Moreover, a ray from x intersects $\{c_{-,l}(t), t \in (-\infty,\infty)\}$ iff it intersects some $\{c_{x_0,w^-}(t), t \in (-\infty,1)\}$ with $w^- \in \mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{-,l}$. A similar assertion is also valid for perturbations to the right side.*

6 Curvature and extension of geodesics

6.1 Definition of curvature

Now we define the curvature of a piecewise flat Finsler surface M at a vertex x. As it is a local geometric quantity, we only need to define it in the tangent cone T_xM.

Let $v^{\pm}$ be a unit incoming or outgoing tangent vector at x. We have described several perturbations for the geodesic ray $R_{x,v^{\pm}}$, i.e., the geodesics $c_{x_0,w^{\pm}}(t)$, $c_{\pm,l}(t)$ and $c_{\pm,r}(t)$.

Definition 6.1 *Let M be a piecewise flat Finsler surface and T_xM the tangent cone of a vertex $x \in M$.*

(1) For the unit incoming tangent vector v^-, the curvature of the tangent cone T_xM in the direction of v^- is

$$\begin{aligned} K(x,v^-) &= \sphericalangle_x^+(\{c_{+,l}(t), t\in(-\infty,\infty)\}) + \sphericalangle_x^+(\{c_{+,r}(t), t\in(-\infty,\infty)\}) \\ &\quad -l_x^+(\mathcal{S}_x^+M). \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

(2) For the unit outgoing tangent vector v^+ at x, the curvature of the tangent cone T_xM in the direction of v^+ is

$$\begin{aligned} K(x,v^+) &= \sphericalangle_x^-(\{c_{-,l}(t), t\in(-\infty,\infty)\}) + \sphericalangle_x^-(\{c_{-,r}(t), t\in(-\infty,\infty)\}) \\ &\quad -l_x^-(\mathcal{S}_x^-M). \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

(3) For a unit incoming or outgoing vector $v^\pm$ at $x \in M$, the curvature $K(x,v^\pm)$ is just the curvature of the tangent cone T_xM in the direction of $v^\pm$ at x.

In the following we first make several fundamental observations.

First, although we use an orientation on T_xM, i.e., a local orientation on M to distinguish the left side and right side, the choice of the local orientation does not affect the curvature defined. If x is not a vertex, we always have $K(x,v^\pm) = 0$ for all unit tangent vectors (so the curvature of a piecewise flat Finsler surface only concentrates on the vertices). We may add more edges and vertices to the triangulation on M, which changes a non-vertex point x to a vertex. It is easy to see that the new vertex has 0 curvatures for all tangent vectors.

Second, in case that M is a piecewise flat Riemannian surface, the above definition coincides with $K = 2\pi - \sum \alpha_i$ where α_i is the angle for each cone in T_xM; see [12]. Notice that in Riemannian context, the curvature is independent of the unit tangent vector $v^\pm$. However, in Finsler context, it is natural that the curvature depends on a nonzero base vector, e.g., the flag curvature of a general Finsler space.

If M is a reversible, it is not hard to observe that $K(x,v) = K(x,-v)$, where v is an outgoing tangent vector at x, and $-v$ is viewed as an incoming tangent vector at x. In the next subsection, we will prove an even stronger statement when M is of Landsberg type, i.e. the curvature at a vertex point $x \in M$ is independent of the unit incoming or outgoing tangent vector $v^\pm \in \mathcal{S}_x^\pm M$. So it is a generalization for the curvature form for a smooth Landsberg surface [3]. This observation will be reverified in the last section when we prove the combinatoric Gauss-Bonnet formula.

6.2 Curvature of a piecewise flat Landsberg surface

In this subsection, We study the curvature property of a piecewise flat Landsberg surface.

Theorem 6.2 *Let M be a piecewise flat Finsler surface of Landsberg type. Then the curvature at a vertex x is independent of $v^\pm \in \mathcal{S}_x^\pm M$.*

Proof. For the convenience, we fix a local orientation at $x \in M$, i.e., we fix an orientation on the tangent cone T_xM.

We first prove that $K(x, v^-)$ is independent of $v^- \in \mathcal{S}_x^- M$. The discussion can be carried out in the tangent cone T_xM. For any $v_0^-, v_1^- \in \mathcal{S}_x^- M$, there exists a piecewise smooth monotonous family of unit vectors $v_s^- \in \mathcal{S}_x^- M$, $s \in [0,1]$, connecting them. With respect to the chosen orientation, there are perturbation geodesics $c_{+,l}(t)$ and $c_{+,r}(t)$ for each ray R_{x,v_s^-}, which are denoted as $\{c_{s,+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ and $\{c_{s,+,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$, respectively.

Now for any $s \in [0,1]$, $\{c_{s,+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ is a finite union

$$R_{x_{s,1}, u_{s,1}^-} \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^{m_s - 1} L_{x_{s,i}, x_{s,i+1}}) \cup R_{x_{s,m_s}, u_{s,m_s}^+},$$

where each $x_{s,i} = c_{s,+,l}(t_{s,i}) \neq x$ lies on the edge E_i. Note that the rays and line segments are not contained in edges, but are contained in the Minkowski cones $(C_{x,i}, F_i)$, $i = 0, 1, \ldots, m_s$, respectively. Moreover, we have the unit tangent vectors $u_{s,i}^{\pm} = \dot{c}_{s,+,l}^{\pm}(t_{s,i}) \in \mathcal{S}_{x_i}^+(T_xM)$, $u_{s,1}^- = v_s^-$, and $u_{s,i}^+ = u_{s,i+1}^-$ (because they are in the same direction of $L_{x_{s,i}, x_{s,i+1}}$). Denote the edges of $C_{x,i}$ as E_i and E_{i+1}, and for $1 \leq i \leq m_s$, we have $E_i = C_{x,i-1} \cap C_{x,i}$.

The curvature $K(x, v_s^-)$ depends continuously on the parameter s. For almost all $s \in [0,1]$, none of $u_{s,i}^{\pm}$ is parallel to any edge. Let $s_0 \in [0,1]$ be such a generic parameter. Then for s sufficiently close to s_0, m_s is a constant m, i.e.,

$$\{c_{s,+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\} = R_{x_{s,1}, u_{s,1}^-} \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} L_{x_{s,i}, x_{s,i+1}}) \cup R_{x_{s,m}, u_{s,m}^+},$$

for all $s \in (s_0 - \epsilon, s_0 + \epsilon)$ with sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$.

By the Landsberg condition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \frac{d}{ds} v_s^-|_{s=s_0}, \frac{d}{ds} v_s^-|_{s=s_0} \rangle_{v_{s_0}^-}^{F_0} &= \langle \frac{d}{ds} u_{1,s}^-|_{s=s_0}, \frac{d}{ds} u_{1,s}^-|_{s=s_0} \rangle_{u_{1,s}^-}^{F_1} \\
&= \langle \frac{d}{ds} u_{1,s}^+|_{s=s_0}, \frac{d}{ds} u_{1,s}^+|_{s=s_0} \rangle_{u_{1,s}^+}^{F_1} \\
&= \langle \frac{d}{ds} u_{2,s}^-|_{s=s_0}, \frac{d}{ds} u_{2,s}^-|_{s=s_0} \rangle_{u_{2,s}^-}^{F_2} \\
&= \cdots \\
&= \langle \frac{d}{ds} u_{m,s}^+|_{s=s_0}, \frac{d}{ds} u_{m,s}^+|_{s=s_0} \rangle_{u_{m,s}^+}^{F_m}. \qquad (6.9)
\end{aligned}$$

By (6.9) and a similar equality for $c_{s,+,r}(t)$, we get $\frac{d}{ds} K(x, v_s^-)|_{s=s_0} = 0$. Combining this fact with the continuity of $K(x, v_s^-)$ for the parameter s, we conclude that $K(x, v_s^-) \equiv$ const, for $s \in [0,1]$, i.e., $K(x, v^-)$ is independent of $v^- \in \mathcal{S}_x^- M$.

A similar argument shows that $K(x, v^+)$ is independent of $v^+ \in \mathcal{S}_x^+ M$.

Above argument can also be used to prove

Assertion (C). For any point x on a piecewise flat Landsberg surface, we have $l_x^+(\mathcal{S}_x^+ M) = l_x^-(\mathcal{S}_x^- M)$.

Let v_s^- move monotonously around the whole circle $\mathcal{S}_x^- M$. Then with respect to the chosen orientation in T_xM, the ray in $\{c_{s,+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ for t going to ∞ defines a vector $v_s^+ \in \mathcal{S}_x^+ M$ which also moves monotonously around the whole circle $\mathcal{S}_x^+ M$. By (6.9), we get $l_x^+(\mathcal{S}_x^+ M) = l_x^-(\mathcal{S}_x^- M)$, which proves the assertion.

Finally, we prove that $K(x, v^-) = K(x, v^+)$ for any $v^\pm \in \mathcal{S}_x^\pm M$.

Consider a vector $v_1^+ \in \mathcal{S}_x^+ M$. There exists a non-negative integer m, such that

$$(m-1) \cdot l_x^+(\mathcal{S}_x^+ M) < K(x, v_1^+) \leq m \cdot l_x^+(\mathcal{S}_x^+ M). \tag{6.10}$$

Assume $m = 0$, i.e., $K(x, v_1^+) \leq 0$. We have two geodesics $\{c_{1,-,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ and $\{c_{1,-,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ which define $v_0^-, v_1^- \in \mathcal{S}_x^- M$ respectively by their rays when t goes to $-\infty$. Consider a piecewise smooth family of vectors $v_s^- \in \mathcal{S}_x^- M$, $s \in [0, 1]$, connecting v_0^- and v_1^-, which rotates around $\mathcal{S}_x^- M$ anti-clockwise (with respect to the given orientation), but does not cover the whole circle $\mathcal{S}_x^- M$. Then for any v_s^-, we have the geodesic $c_{s,+,r}(t)$ which defines $v_s^+ \in \mathcal{S}_x^+ M$ by the ray for t going to $+\infty$. Notice that v_1^+ coincides the one we are using. By a similar equality as (6.9), we have

$$l_x^-(\{v_s^-, s \in [0, 1]\}) = l_x^+(\{v_s^+, s \in [0, 1]\}). \tag{6.11}$$

The outgoing tangent vectors v_s^+ at x for $s \in [0, 1]$ also rotate anti-clockwise, and they can not cover the whole circle $\mathcal{S}_x^+ M$.

Notice that the geodesics $c_{1,-,l}(t)$ and $c_{0,+,r}(t)$ can also be used to define the curvature $K(x, v_0^-)$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} K(x, v_0^-) &= \sphericalangle_x^+(\{c_{1,-,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}) + \sphericalangle_x^+(\{c_{0,+,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}) - l_x^+(\mathcal{S}_x^+ M) \\ &= -l_x^+(\{v_s^+, s \in [0, 1]\}) = -l_x^-(\{v_s^-, s \in [0, 1]\}) \\ &= \sphericalangle_x^-(\{c_{1,-,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}) + \sphericalangle_x^-(\{c_{1,-,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}) - l_x^-(\mathcal{S}_x^- M) \\ &= K(x, v_1^+). \end{aligned}$$

This finish the proof when the curvature is non-positive.

In the case that $K(x, v_1^+) > 0$, i.e., the integer m in (6.10) is positive, the argument is almost the same. We still have v_0^- and v_1^- defined from the rays in the geodesics $c_{-,l}(t)$ and $c_{-,r}(t)$ when t goes to $-\infty$. We just need to change the monotonous family $\{v_s^-, s \in [0, 1]\}$ in $\mathcal{S}_x^- M$, such that when s goes from 0 to 1, they rotate clockwise around the whole circle $\mathcal{S}_x^- M$ for $m - 1$ times (and reach some part of it for one more time). Then so do the family $\{v_s^+, s \in [0, 1]\}$ in $\mathcal{S}_x^+ M$, and we have

$$K(x, v_0^-) = l_x^+(\{v_s^+, s \in [0, 1]\}) = l_x^-(\{v_s^-, s \in [0, 1]\}) = K(x, v_1^+),$$

which completes the proof of the theorem. ■

Remark 6.3 *Based on this theorem, we can simply denote the curvature of a piecewise flat Landsberg surface as $K(x)$.*

Also we restate Assertion (C) as the following proposition.

Proposition 6.4 *For any point x on a piecewise flat Landsberg surface, we have $l_x^+(\mathcal{S}_x^+ M) = l_x^-(\mathcal{S}_x^- M)$.*

6.3 The answer to Question 5.4

Now we are ready to answer Question 5.4. For the extension of a geodesic in the positive direction, we have

Theorem 6.5 *Let M be a piecewise flat Finsler surface and T_xM be the tangent cone at a vertex $x \in M$. Let $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, 0]\}$ be a unit speed geodesic in the tangent cone T_xM with $c(0) = x$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *$c(t)$ can be extended to a geodesic defined on $(-\infty, \infty)$.*

(2) *$K(x, \dot{c}^-(0)) \leq 0$.*

(3) *There exists a ray R_{x,w^+} such that $w^+ \neq -\dot{c}^-(0)$ and it does not intersect any $\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ or $\{c_{+,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$.*

(4) *There exists a ray R_{x,w^+} which does not intersect any of the geodesics $\{c_{x_0,w'^+}(t), t \in [-1, \infty)\}$ with $c(-1) = x_0$, and $w'^+ \in \mathcal{S}^{+,l}_{x_0}$ or $\mathcal{S}^{+,r}_{x_0}$.*

Proof. The equivalence between (3) and (4) has been established in Lemma 5.5.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) If $K(x, \dot{c}(0)^-) \leq 0$, then by Definition 6.7, $\mathrm{Pr}^+_x\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ and $\mathrm{Pr}^-_x\{c_{+,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ are disconnected open curves in the circle $\mathcal{S}^+_x M$, i.e., there exists a vector $w^+ \neq -\dot{c}(0)^-$ in

$$\mathcal{S}^+_x M \backslash (\mathrm{Pr}^+_x\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\} \cup \mathrm{Pr}^-_x\{c_{+,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}).$$

Notice that $\mathrm{Pr}^+_x\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ and $\mathrm{Pr}^-_x\{c_{+,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ are independent of the particular choice of the perturbations whenever the side has been chosen. So the ray R_{x,w^+} has no intersection with any geodesics $\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ and $\{c_{+,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2) It is easily seen that the outgoing tangent vector $w^+ \neq -\dot{c}(0)^-$ at x is contained in

$$\mathcal{S}^+_x M \backslash (\mathrm{Pr}^+_x\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\} \cup \mathrm{Pr}^-_x\{c_{+,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}),$$

and $-\dot{c}(0)^-$ is a common end point of $\mathrm{Pr}^+_x\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ and $\mathrm{Pr}^-_x\{c_{+,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$. So

$$\mathrm{Pr}^+_x\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\} \cap \mathrm{Pr}^-_x\{c_{+,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\} = \emptyset,$$

which implies that

$$K(x, v^-) = \sphericalangle^+_x(\{c_{+,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}) + \sphericalangle^+_x(\{c_{+,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}) - l^+_x(\mathcal{S}^+_x M) \leq 0.$$

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (4) Let $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)$ be the unit speed geodesic consisting of two rays. Assume conversely that there exists a geodesic $\{c_{x_0,w'^+}(t), t \in [-1, \infty)\}$, where $c(-1) = c_{x_0,w'^+}(-1) = x_0$, $w'^+ \in \mathcal{S}^+_{x_0} M \backslash \{\pm\dot{c}(-1)^+\}$, and $c(t') = c_{x_0,w'^+}(t'') = x_1$ with $t' > 0$. Then by Lemma 4.8, we have $l(\{c_{x_0,w'^+}(t), t \in [-1, t'']\}) < l(\{c(t), t \in [-1, t']\})$. So $c(t)$ is not a minimizing geodesic from x_0 to x_1. This is a contradiction with Lemma 4.2.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (1) By Theorem 6.9 below, for any two different points x' and x'' in the tangent cone T_xM, there exists a minimizing geodesic connecting x' and x''. Let $x' = c(-1)$ and $x'' \neq x$ be any point on the ray indicated in (4). Then by Lemma 6.9, and our assumptions in (4), the minimizing geodesic from x' to x'' must be the union of $L_{x',x}$ and $L_{x,x''}$, i.e., $c(t)$ can be extended to a geodesic consisting of two rays.

This completes the proof of Theorem 6.5. ■

For the extension of a geodesic in the negative direction, we have

Theorem 6.6 *Let M be a piecewise flat Finsler surface and T_xM be the tangent cone at a vertex $x \in M$. Let $\{c(t), t \in [0, -\infty)\}$ be a unit speed geodesic in the tangent cone T_xM with $c(0) = x$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *$c(t)$ can be extended to a geodesic defined on $(-\infty, \infty)$.*

(2) *$K(x, \dot{c}(0)^+) \leq 0$.*

(3) *There exists a ray R_{x,w^-} such that $w^- \neq -\dot{c}(0)^+$ and it does not intersect any $\{c_{-,l}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ or $\{c_{-,r}(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$.*

(4) *There exists a ray R_{x,w^-} which does not intersect any of the geodesics $\{c_{x_0,w'^-}(t)$, $t \in (-\infty, 1]\}$, where $c(1) = x_0$, and $w'^+ \in \mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{-,l}$ or $\mathcal{S}_{x_0}^{-,r}$.*

The proof is similar to the previous one, so we omit it.

The following is the restatement of Theorem 6.5 and 6.6 in the context of M instead of T_xM.

Corollary 6.7 *Let M be a piecewise flat Finsler surface and T_xM be the tangent cone at a vertex $x \in M$. Then a unit speed geodesic $\{c(t), t \in (-\epsilon, 0]$ (resp. $\{c(t), t \in [0, \epsilon)\}$) on M with $c(0) = x$ can be extended at x if and only if $K(x, \dot{c}(0)^-) \leq 0$ (resp. $K(x, \dot{c}(0)^-) \geq 0$).*

From the proof of Theorem 6.5 and 6.6, we also get the following

Corollary 6.8 *Let M be a piecewise flat Finsler surface and T_xM the tangent cone at the vertex $x \in M$. If the rays in (3) and (4) of Theorem 6.5 and 6.6 exist, then they exhaust all the extensions of the geodesic $c(t)$ for $t \in (-\infty, \infty)$. When $K(x, v^\pm) < 0$, there are infinitely many such extensions. When $K(x, v^\pm) = 0$, there exists a unique such extension. When $K(x, v^\pm) > 0$, there exists no such extensions.*

This also gives an interpretation to Lemma 4.6. In fact, if x is not a vertex, then the curvature is always 0. Thus the extension of a geodesic at x exists uniquely. The notions of curvature we define in this paper plays the same role as their counter part in the Riemannian case, i.e., for $v^\pm \in \mathcal{S}_x^\pm M$, $-K(x, v^\pm)$ is the measure for all the geodesics extending $R_{x,v^\pm}$ at x. When $K(x, v^\pm) > 0$, the virtual measure for such extensions is negative. It explains why there exists no such extensions in this case.

At the final part of this section, we prove a general result on the existence of minimizing geodesic.

Theorem 6.9 *For any two different points x' and x'' in the tangent cone T_xM, there exists a minimizing geodesic from x' to x''.*

Proof. When x is in the complement of edges and vertices, the theorem is obvious. When x is an edge point but not a vertex, it has been proven by Theorem 4.7. So we may assume x is a vertex, and then T_xM contains at least 3 Minkowski cones.

First we consider the case $x' = x$. We claim that $L_{x,x''}$ is the minimizing geodesic from x' to x''. Assume conversely that this is not true. Then there exists a shorter path $\{p(t), x, x''\}$ from x to x'', consisting of a finite sequence of straight line segments. Using the triangular inequality repeatedly, we will get $l(\{p(t), x, x''\}) \geq l(L_{x,x''})$, which is a contradiction. The argument for the case $x'' = x$ is similar.

Now we assume $x' \neq x$ and $x'' \neq x$. If x' and x'' are contained in the same Minkowski cone such that $d(x', x'') = l(L_{x',x''})$, then $L_{x',x''}$ is the minimizing geodesic from x' to x''. If $d(x', x'') = l(L_{x',x}) + l(L_{x,x''})$, then the two straight line segments from x' to x, and from x to x'' gives the minimizing geodesic from x' to x''.

If the minimizing geodesic from x' to x'' can not be realized as above, then there exists $c > 0$ satisfying the following conditions:

(1) If x' and x'' are contained in the same Minkowski cone, then $d(x', x'')+c < l(L_{x',x''})$.

(2) $c < d(x', x) + d(x, x'') - d(x', x'')$.

Then we can find a sequence of piecewise linear paths $\{p_n(t), x', x''\}$ from x' to x'', $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that each path consists of a finite sequence of straight line segments, and its arc length satisfies

$$l(\{p_n(t), x', x''\}) < d(x', x'') + \frac{c}{2n}. \tag{6.12}$$

Then $l(\{p_n(t), x', x''\}) < d(x', x) + d(x, x'')$, and $l(\{p_n(t), x', x''\}) < l(L_{x',x''})$ when x' and x'' are in the same cone.

Using the triangular inequality repeatedly, we can make $\{p_n(t), x', x''\}$ even shorter by assuming the following:

(1) $\{p_n(t), x', x''\} = L_{x',x_{n,1}} \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^{m_n-1} L_{x_{n,i},x_{n,i+1}}) \cup L_{x_{n,m_n},x''}$.

(2) The points $x_{n,1}$, ..., x_{n,m_n} are on the edges.

If some $x_{n,i}$ is sufficiently close to x, say, $d(x_{n,i}, x) + d(x, x_{n,i}) < c/6$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x', x'') + c &< d(x', x) + d(x, x'') \leq l(\{p_n(t), x', x''\}) + d(x_{n,i}, x) + d(x, x_{n,i}) \\ &< d(x', x'') + \frac{5}{6}c, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. On the other hand, each $x_{n,i}$ can not be too far away from x either, because

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{n,i}, x) + d(x, x_{n,i}) &\leq l(\{p_n(t), x', x''\}) + d(x, x') + d(x'', x) \\ &\leq d(x', x) + d(x, x') + d(x'', x) + d(x, x''). \end{aligned}$$

If there exists a edge containing at least one of the pairs $(x_{n,i}, x_{n,i+1})$, $(x', x_{n,1})$, or (x_{n,m_n}, x''), then by the triangular inequality there exists a shorter path $p_n(t)$ (in this case the number m_n will decrease at the same time). Notice that our assumptions for the constant c and the path $p_n(t)$ implies that x', x'', and the $x_{n,i}$'s can not be contained in the same edge. To summarize, we can further require $p_n(t)$ to satisfy

(3) For each i, $c_1 < d(x_{n,i}, x) + d(x, x_{n,i}) < c_2$, where c_1 and c_2 are positive numbers independent of n and i.

(4) None of the straight line segments $L_{x',x_{n,1}}$, $L_{x_{n,1},x_{n,2}}$, ..., $L_{x_{n,m_n-1},x_{n,m_n}}$ and $L_{x_{n,m_n},x''}$ is contained in any edge.

By (3), there exists a constant $c_3 > 0$, independent of n and i, such that $d(x_{n,i}, x_{n,i+1}) > c_3$. So by (2), there exists a universal bound $N > 0$ such that $m_n < N$ for all n.

Therefore, passing to suitable sub-sequence $\{p_n(t), x', x''\}$ with the same $m_n = m$ if necessary, we can get $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_{n,i} = x_i$ simultaneously, $\forall 1 \leq i \leq m$. Note that all the paths $p_n(t)$ are parametrized by the arc length. Hence $p(t) = \lim p_n(t)$ is a finite union of line segement, which defines a minimizing geodesic from x' to x''. ■

7 A combinational Gauss-Bonnet formula for connected piecewise flat Landsberg surface

In this section, we assume M is a connected piecewise flat Landsberg surface. The next lemma follows immediately from the connectedness of M and the Landsberg condition.

Lemma 7.1 *Let M be a connected piecewise flat Landsberg surface. Then for any $x \in M$ which is not a vertex, $l_x^{\pm}(\mathcal{S}_x^{\pm}M)$ is a constant.*

In the following, we will denote the above constant as θ_M.

Our goal in this section is to prove a combinatoric Gauss-Bonnet formula.

Theorem 7.2 *Let M be a compact connected piecewise flat Landsberg surface (without boundary). Then*

$$\sum_{x\in M} K(x) = \theta_M \chi(M), \tag{7.13}$$

where θ_M is the constant in Lemma 7.1 and $\chi(M)$ is the Euler characteristic number.

To prove Theorem 7.2, we first make some observations.

(1) One can add more vertices and edges for the triangulation of M. In fact, the curvature at a new vertex x is 0. The curvature at an old vertex x will not be changed by adding more edges associated with it. So the left side of (7.13) is not changed by this procedure.

(2) One can suitably add some vertices and edges such that the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) The total number of the vertices is even.

(b) The vertices can be listed as $\{z_i, i = 1, \ldots, 2m\}$ such that for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, there exists an edge between z_{2i-1} and z_{2i}.

To see this, we consider a vertex z_1 in each step. Assume there exists a Minkowski triangle in M with vertices z_1, z_2 and z_3. We then add a vertex z_4 at the geometric center of the this triangle, and add three edges connecting z_4 to z_1, z_2 and z_3, respectively. Pair z_1 with z_4. Then we continue to consider other vertices. In each step, the number of vertices which has not been paired decrease by 1. So after finite steps, all the vertices are paired, and they can be listed as in (2) such that for each i, z_{2i-1} and z_{2i} have been paired together.

(3) Consider a geodesic $\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}$ in T_xM which does not pass the vertex x. Assume this geodesic can be presented as

$$R_{x_1,u_1^-} \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} L_{x_i,x_{i+1}}) \cup R_{x_m,u_m^+},$$

where each $x_i \neq x$ is on the edge $E_i = C_{x,i-1} \cap C_{x,i}$, and the rays and line segments are contained in the Minkowski cones $C_{x,i}$, $i = 0, \ldots, m$, respectively. Denote $u_i^{\pm}$ with $u_i^+ = u_{i+1}^-$ the unit outgoing or incoming tangent vector of $c(t)$ at each x_i, and v_i the unit tangent vector in the direction from x to x_i. Then we have

Lemma 7.3 1) $\measuredangle_x^+(\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}) = \angle_{x_1}^+(-u_1^-, v_1) + \angle_{x_1}^-(u_1^-, v_1)$.
2) $\measuredangle_x^-(\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}) = \angle_{x_m}^-(-u_m^+, -v_m) + \angle_{x_m}^+(u_m^+, -v_m)$.

Proof. 1) By the Landsberg condition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\angle_{x_1}^-(u_1^-, v_1) &= \angle_{x_1}^+(u_1^+, v_1) \\
&= \angle_x^+(v_1, v_2) + \angle_{x_2}^-(u_2^-, v_2) \\
&= \angle_x^+(v_1, v_2) + \angle_{x_2}^+(u_2^+, v_2) \\
&= \angle_x^+(v_1, v_2) + \angle_x^+(v_2, v_3) + \angle_{x_3}^-(u_3^-, v_3) \\
&= \cdots \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \angle_x^+(v_i, v_{i+1}) + \angle_{x_m}^+(v_m, u_m^+).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\measuredangle_x^+(\{c(t), t \in (-\infty, \infty)\}) &= \angle_{x_1}^+(-u_1^-, v_1) + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \angle_x^+(v_i, v_{i+1}) + \angle_{x_m}^+(v_m, u_m^+) \\
&= \angle_{x_1}^+(-u_1^-, v_1) + \angle_{x_1}^-(u_1^-, v_1).
\end{aligned}$$

2) The proof is similar. ■

(4) In each Minkowski triangle with vertices z_1, z_2 and z_3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_M &= \measuredangle_{z_1}^+(L_{z_2,z_3}) + \measuredangle_{z_1}^-(L_{z_2,z_3}) + \measuredangle_{z_2}^+(L_{z_1,z_3}) + \measuredangle_{z_2}^-(L_{z_1,z_3}) \\
&\quad + \measuredangle_{z_3}^+(L_{z_1,z_2}) + \measuredangle_{z_3}^-(L_{z_1,z_2}) \\
&= \angle_{z_1}^+(v_{z_1,z_2}, v_{z_1,z_3}) + \angle_{z_1}^-(v_{z_2,z_1}, v_{z_3,z_1}) + \angle_{z_2}^+(v_{z_2,z_1}, v_{z_2,z_3}) \\
&\quad + \angle_{z_2}^-(v_{z_1,z_2}, v_{z_3,z_2}) + \angle_{z_3}^+(v_{z_3,z_1}, v_{z_3,z_2}) + \angle_{z_3}^-(v_{z_1,z_3}, v_{z_2,z_3}). \qquad (7.14)
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $z_4 \notin L_{z_2,z_1}$ on the ray extending L_{z_2,z_1}, we have

$$\angle^-_{z_1}(v_{z_4,z_1}, v_{z_3,z_1}) = \angle^-_{z_2}(v_{z_1,z_2}, v_{z_3,z_2}) + \angle^+_{z_3}(v_{z_3,z_1}, v_{z_3,z_2}), \tag{7.15}$$

and

$$\angle^+_{z_1}(v_{z_1,z_4}, v_{z_1,z_3}) = \angle^+_{z_2}(v_{z_2,z_1}, v_{z_2,z_3}) + \angle^-_{z_3}(v_{z_1,z_3}, v_{z_2,z_3}). \tag{7.16}$$

These obvious facts are natural generalizations of fundamental facts in classical geometry, and we will omit the proof.

(5) Consider two Minkowski triangles (T_1, F_1) and (T_2, F_2) in M whose vertices are $\{z_1, z_2, z_3\}$ and $\{z_1, z_2, z_4\}$, respectively. Denote the curvature at z_1 and z_2 as $K(z_1)$ and $K(z_2)$, respectively. Then we have

Lemma 7.4 $K(z_1) + K(z_2) = 2\theta_M - l^\pm_{z_1}(\mathcal{S}^\pm_{z_1}M) - l^\pm_{z_2}(\mathcal{S}^\pm_{z_2}M)$.

Notice that by Proposition 6.4, at each vertex z_i, we have $l^+_{z_i}(\mathcal{S}^+_{z_i}M) = l^-_{z_i}(\mathcal{S}^-_{z_i}M)$.

Proof. Fix two geodesics $c_1(t)$ and $c_2(t)$ in T_1 and T_2 which are sufficiently close and parallel to the edge L_{z_1,z_2}, respectively. Assume the geodesic $c_1(t)$ intersects with L_{z_2,z_3} at x_1, and with L_{z_1,z_3} at x_2. Suppose the geodesic $c_2(t)$ intersects with L_{z_2,z_4} at x_3, and with L_{z_1,z_4} at x_4. Moreover, we assume that the direction of $c_1(t)$ is from x_1 to x_2, and that of $c_2(t)$ is from x_3 to x_4. Then by Theorem 6.2, Lemma 7.3, and (7.14)-(7.16), we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
& K(z_1) + K(z_2) \\
= \;& \angle^-_{x_1}(v_{z_3,x_1}, v_{x_2,x_1}) + \angle^+_{x_1}(v_{x_1,z_2}, v_{x_1,x_2}) + \angle^-_{x_3}(v_{z_4,x_3}, v_{x_4,x_3}) + \angle^+_{x_3}(v_{x_3,z_2}, v_{x_3,x_4}) \\
& -l^-_{z_2}(\mathcal{S}^-_{z_2}M) \\
& \angle^+_{x_2}(v_{x_2,z_3}, v_{x_2,x_1}) + \angle^-_{x_2}(v_{z_1,x_2}, v_{x_1,x_2}) + \angle^+_{x_4}(v_{x_4,z_4}, v_{x_4,x_3}) + \angle^-_{x_4}(v_{z_1,x_4}, v_{x_3,x_4}) \\
& -l^+_{z_1}(\mathcal{S}^+_{z_1}M) \\
= \;& \angle^-_{x_1}(v_{z_3,x_1}, v_{x_2,x_1}) + (\angle^-_{x_2}(v_{z_3,x_2}, v_{x_1,x_2}) + \angle^+_{z_3}(v_{z_3,x_1}, v_{z_3,x_2})) + \angle^-_{x_3}(v_{z_4,x_3}, v_{x_4,x_3}) \\
& +(\angle^-_{x_4}(v_{z_4,x_4}, v_{x_3,x_4}) + \angle^+_{z_4}(v_{z_4,x_3}, v_{z_4,x_4})) + \angle^+_{x_2}(v_{x_2,z_3}, v_{x_2,x_1}) + (\angle^+_{x_1}(v_{x_1,z_3}, v_{x_1,x_2}) \\
& +\angle^-_{z_3}(v_{x_2,z_3}, v_{x_1,z_3})) + \angle^+_{x_4}(v_{x_4,z_4}, v_{x_4,x_3}) + (\angle^+_{x_3}(v_{x_3,z_4}, v_{x_3,x_4}) + \angle^-_{z_4}(v_{z_4,x_4}, v_{z_4,x_3})) \\
& -l^\pm_{z_1}(\mathcal{S}^\pm_{z_1}M) - l^\pm_{z_2}(\mathcal{S}^\pm_{z_2}M) \\
= \;& (\angle^+_{z_1}(v_{z_1,z_3}, v_{z_1,z_2}) + \angle^-_{z_1}(v_{z_3,z_1}, v_{z_2,z_1}) + \angle^+_{z_2}(v_{z_2,z_3}, v_{z_2,z_1}) + \angle^-_{z_2}(v_{z_3,z_2}, v_{z_1,z_2}) \\
& +\angle^+_{z_3}(v_{z_3,z_2}, v_{z_3,z_1}) + \angle^-_{z_3}(v_{z_1,z_3}, v_{z_2,z_3})) + (\angle^+_{z_1}(v_{z_1,z_4}, v_{z_1,z_2}) + \angle^-_{z_1}(v_{z_4,z_1}, v_{z_2,z_1}) \\
& +\angle^+_{z_2}(v_{z_2,z_4}, v_{z_2,z_1}) + \angle^-_{z_2}(v_{z_4,z_2}, v_{z_1,z_2}) + \angle^+_{z_4}(v_{z_4,z_2}, v_{z_4,z_1}) + \angle^-_{z_4}(v_{z_4,z_1}, v_{z_4,z_2})) \\
& -l^\pm_{z_1}(\mathcal{S}^\pm_{z_1}M) - l^\pm_{z_2}(\mathcal{S}^\pm_{z_2}M) \\
= \;& 2\theta_M - l^\pm_{z_1}(\mathcal{S}^\pm_{z_1}M) - l^\pm_{z_2}(\mathcal{S}^\pm_{z_2}M)
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. ■

Proof of Theorem 7.2 If necessary, we add more vertices and edges such that the set of all different vertices in M can be listed as $\{z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{2m-1}, z_{2m}\}$, such that for $1 \le i \le m$, $L_{z_{2i-1},z_{2i}}$ is an edge. We also list all the Minkowski triangles in M as $\{T_1, \ldots, T_n\}$ and denote the vertices of T_j as $z_{j,1}$, $z_{j,2}$ and $z_{j,3}$. It is easily known that the total number of the edges is $3n/2$, which implies that n is an even number, and $\chi(M) = 2m - \frac{1}{2}n$.

By Lemma 7.4, for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, we have

$$K(z_{2i-1}) + K(z_{2i}) = 2\theta_M - l^{\pm}_{z_{2i-1}}(\mathcal{S}^{\pm}_{z_{2i-1}}M) - l^{\pm}_{z_{2i}}(\mathcal{S}^{\pm}_{z_{2i}}M). \tag{7.17}$$

Taking the summation of (7.17) for all i, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{x\in M} K(x) &= 2m\theta_M - \sum_{i=1}^{2m} l^{\pm}_{z_i}(\mathcal{S}^{\pm}_{z_i}M) \\ &= 2m\theta_M - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{2m}(l^{+}_{z_i}(\mathcal{S}^{+}_{z_i}M) + l^{-}_{z_i}(\mathcal{S}^{-}_{z_i}M))\end{aligned}$$

The angles in $\sum_{i=1}^{2m}(l^{+}_{z_i}(\mathcal{S}^{+}_{z_i}M) + l^{-}_{z_i}(\mathcal{S}^{-}_{z_i}M))$ can be calculated triangle by triangle, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{x\in M} K(x) &= 2m\theta_M - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(\sphericalangle^{+}_{z_{j,1}}(L_{z_{j,2},z_{j,3}}) + \sphericalangle^{-}_{z_{j,1}}(L_{z_{j,2},z_{j,3}}) + \sphericalangle^{+}_{z_{j,2}}(L_{z_{j,1},z_{j,3}}) \\ &\quad + \sphericalangle^{-}_{z_{j,2}}(L_{z_{j,1},z_{j,3}}) + \sphericalangle^{+}_{z_{j,3}}(L_{z_{j,1},z_{j,2}}) + \sphericalangle^{-}_{z_{j,3}}(L_{z_{j,1},z_{j,2}}) \\ &= \theta_M(2m - \frac{1}{2}n) = \theta_M\chi(M).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 7.2.

Acknowledgement. We are grateful to the referee for valuable comments and suggestions. We are indebted to Professor Fuquan Fang for providing us with some references about piecewise flat geometry, and Huibin Chang for some inspiring discussions.

References

[1] S. Bacso, X. Cheng and Z. Shen, Curvature properties of (α, β)-metrics, in Finsler Geometry, Sapporo 2005 - In Memory of Makoto Matsumoto, ed. S. Sabaxu and H. Shimada, Advanced Studies in Pure Mathematics 48, Mathematical Society of Japan, (2007), 73-110.

[2] D. Bao and S. S. Chern, A note on the Gauss-Bonnet theorem for Finsler spaces, Ann. Math., vol. 143 (1996), 233-252.

[3] D. Bao, S. S. Chern and Z. Shen, An Introduction to Riemannian-Finsler Geometry, Springer, 2000.

[4] D. Bao, S. S. Chern and Z. Shen, On the Gauss-Bonnet integrand for 4-dimensional Landsberg spaces, Cont. Math., vol. 196 (1996), 15-26.

[5] J. Cheeger, W. Müller and R. Schrader, On the curvature of piecewise flat spaces, Comm. Math. Phys., vol. 92, no. 3 (1984), 405-454, MR 0734226, Zbl 0559.53028.

[6] B. Chow and F. Luo, Combinatorial Ricci flows on surfaces, J. Diff. Geom., vol 63 (2003), 97-129, MR 2015261, Zbl 1070.53040.

[7] J. Dai, X. Gu and F. Luo, Variational principles for discrete surfaces, Advanced Lectures in Mathematics (ALM), 4. International Press, Somerville, MA; Higher Education Press, Beijing, 2008, MR 2439807, Zbl 1160.52018.

[8] D. Glickenstein, A combinatorial Yamabe flow in three dimensions, Topology, vol. 44, no. 4 (2005), 791-808, MR 2136535, Zbl 1074.53030.

[9] D. Glickenstein, A maximum principle for combinatorial Yamabe flow, Topology, vol. 44, no. 4 (2005), 809-825, MR 2136536, Zbl 1074.39019.

[10] D. Glickenstein, Discrete conformal variantions and scalar curvature on piecewise flat two- and three-dimensional manifolds, J. Diff. Geom., vol. 87 (2011), 201-237.

[11] G. Randers, On an asymmetric metric in the four-space of general relativity, Physics Rev., 59 (1941), 195-199.

[12] T. Regge, General relativiely without coordinates, Nuovo Cimento (10), vol. 19 (1961), 558-571, MR0127372.

[13] D. Stone, Geodesics in piecewise linear manifolds, Transactions of Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 215 (1976), 1-44.

[14] N.P. Warner, The application of Regge calculus to quantum gravity and quantum field theory in a curved background, Proc. R. Soc., 383 (1982), 359-377.

[15] C.Y. Wong, Application of Regge calculus to the Schwarzschild and Reissner-Nordstrom geometries at the moment of time symmetry, J. Math. Phys., 12 (1971), 70-78.